

FRANCIS DE SALES AND ROBERT BELLARMINE :

A COMPARATIVE STUDY.

BLESSED ROBERT BELLARMINE died in September, 1621, St. Francis de Sales in December, 1622. To the casual student, the juxtaposition of these two dates almost comes with a shock. It seems hard to believe that the two were actually alive and at work at the same time; they seem to belong to other worlds, and to different generations. When we come nearer and compare the two, the wonder is only increased; for if we lay aside the story of their lives, in the men themselves, in their character, their sanctity, and their upbringing, there was much that was very similar. Both were marked from childhood for a natural simplicity and charm of manner, added to a disregard of self, which won for them friendship unsought wherever they went. Both were of remarkable talent, distinguishing themselves in much the same way from their first years in school. Both were educated by the Jesuits; the one in Italy, where Protestantism had as yet but little vogue, the other in Paris, where the new religion had gained a decided footing. Both were ardent theologians; both took a keen interest in the prevalent discussion of the day, on Predestination.

Here the parallel stops. The effect of his studies on the Italian was to make him a fervent champion of the Faith; on Francis, it was only to drive him to the brink of despair, from which, we are told, he was saved only by a special favour of Our Lady. For the rest of their lives, their courses were entirely different. Bellarmine was continually before the learned world, in Louvain and Rome for the most part, but known also in France, and England, and Germany, training priests and religious, disputing with kings, lampooned by enemies far and near. Francis de Sales was chiefly known to a little band of women, who lived in a convent of his own foundation, a few yards up the lane from his own house, in a town of not more than four thousand inhabitants. His biographers tell us that when he preached in his church at Annecy "all the town went to hear him"; but it is to be remembered that "all the town" made no more than a res-

pectable congregation in our time. While Bellarmine lectured in the schools, and by means of his lectures built up a very library of learning, Francis de Sales was converting Calvinists in Le Chablais by means of little flysheets which he wrote from day to day, and distributed from door to door.

We may go further. Bellarmine was expressly called by one of the Popes the most learned theologian of his day, and on that account was made a Cardinal. St. Francis de Sales published in his life-time two comparatively small books on the spiritual life; the rest of his works are only Collectanea, gathered together after his death, and consisting in great part of letters to individuals. Each produced a volume of Controversies; the one contains, and turns to account, all the theological learning of the day against the most redoubted adversaries; the other is made up from the little discussions held by the saint as he went from place to place among the common people. Yet Francis de Sales was known to all the world, and beatified, within forty years of his death; Bellarmine has waited for the same for three hundred years. More than that; fifty years ago St. Francis was declared by Pope Pius IX. a Doctor of the Universal Church; Bellarmine still awaits that honour.

There can be no question here of comparing or contrasting the personal sanctity of two great and holy men; as we have already said, in themselves they had very much in common. Bellarmine, beloved in his old age by the young, who on their recreation days were delighted to have him among them, might well have been St. Francis de Sales himself had the latter lived beyond his fifty-six years. It is rather as a sign of the times in which they lived, and of the change that was then coming, or had already come, over Europe, that we venture to compare or contrast them. Had they lived four hundred years earlier, in the days of St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi, still more in the days of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, there could surely be little question which of the two would first have received the honours of the Church. St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi, both men by nature and grace utterly different from St. Francis de Sales, were canonized within fifteen years of their deaths. St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure towered above others in their generation; beside them a Francis de Sales would be difficult to find. Had Bellarmine lived in their time, it is not too much to conjecture that he would

have shared their honour; Francis de Sales, not improbably, might have been passed over altogether.

What was the change that had come over Europe, and over the Church in Europe, during those four hundred years to produce this difference of appreciation?

When we examine the religious mind in the ages before and during the time of St. Thomas Aquinas, we cannot but be struck by the way that God, as it were, occupies the whole of the picture; God, and creation as it is contained in or is referred to God. The individual soul in itself was of much less account than it is with spiritual writers to-day. In illustration of this we may take as typical of the spiritual outlook of the thirteenth century the three great Dominican mystics who immediately followed Aquinas (1225-1274),—Eckhart (1260-1327), Tauler (1300-1361), and Suso (1295-1366). They are close disciples of St. Thomas, they reproduce his teaching with almost meticulous care; but when they come to apply it to the spiritual life, it is somewhat disconcerting to notice how little account they make of man as such. They are wholly occupied with God. The life of God in Himself, the life of the Blessed Trinity, the relation of the created world to God, the image of God engraved upon the human soul, the indwelling of God in the just, man's knowledge in regard to God, these are the chief preoccupation of these writers. They love to contemplate the essence of God, His silent, complete, all-perfect nature, the three persons of the Trinity in their relation to one another; of man, and the duties of man, they say little more than what concerns this all-important contemplation. Not far removed from them is their yet more famous disciple, Ludolph of Saxony (d. 1378), who was first a Dominican and afterwards a Carthusian. His "*Vita Christi*" is one of the masterpieces of the Church, perhaps the greatest professedly spiritual book written up to his time. Nevertheless it concentrates on the Word Incarnate; man and the life of man are measured entirely in the light of that Word.

But with humanism, and humanistic studies, it was inevitable that men should look more at themselves. With the New Learning it could no longer be a question of God alone absorbing all the rest; man saw more and more that he, too, was part of the picture, and, so far as himself was concerned, a not unimportant part. Already we have in St. Thomas a sign of the coming change; his "*Summa contra Gentiles*," in

which he turns to natural man and professedly deals with him on his own ground, may well be taken as the first volume of the whole humanistic library. In themselves, of course, the discovery and tendency were good. So long as God still remained the first and the last, the beginning and the end, the source from which man came and the goal to which he travelled, in whom he lived and moved and had his being, then the more he realized himself, and his own responsibility, so much the more would he strive for his own perfection, that God might be the more glorified in him. But if he looked too much to himself, and worshipped perfection for its own sake, then might follow the neglect of all else; there might follow the ignoring of God for the sole contemplation of man.

In matter of fact the stream followed both courses. The world of learning and letters became more and more occupied with man himself, leading on to the later romantic poetry and modern novel; and this is often all that is included when modern scholars speak of the humanistic movement. But at the same time theology and the spiritual life responded no less and took new phases. From this time the theologians began to teach and write, not less about God, but more about man, his relations to God, his obligations, and duties, and rewards. Following the lead of Aquinas, man was made the starting-point, the human side of life began to be more considered. The Blessed Sacrament, God given to and living among men, began now to have a new significance; the liturgy which was just the praise of God pure and simple, began to give way to popular devotions which brought the common man more into union with his Lord. Books began to be multiplied, concerning themselves with man and his personal perfection; books on moral theology, telling him more clearly, and far more in detail, what for him was right and what was wrong; books on the spiritual life, not dwelling only on the glories of God, but also on the weaknesses of man, and on the means by which he might be strengthened; books on prayer, no longer of pure outpouring of devotion, such as we may find in Suso and Ludolph, but tending more to system and method, directed to man's own perfection that so he might the more securely attain his goal.

As examples of this new spirit, already in the days of Tauler and Suso, or shortly after, appeared the famous "*Theologia Germanica*," which with careful adaptations

and omissions Luther made so well to serve his purpose. Almost immediately following, in 1417, came the "Imitation of Christ," whose vogue to this day is, perhaps, due to the fact that it was the first spiritual book of its kind to make man, and the perfection of man, definitely its main object. From this time masters of the spiritual life begin to be a class apart. Theology is no longer confined to the schools; it is brought to the level of every reader in catechisms, in sermons, in books of prayer. Councils recommend bishops to have such books composed and circulated. Gerson's "Mirror of Christians" (1470), the "Path to Heaven," the "Consolation of Souls" (1474), the "Garden of the Soul," the "Spiritual Combat" (1503), and the "Manuale Sacerdotum" (1503), are significant titles enough of some of the spiritual books most popular at this time. All reveal a systematic study of the spiritual life, a personal interest in man himself as such, of which there is little trace in Ludolph and his predecessors, and the way to which is only pointed out in the "Imitation of Christ."

But perhaps the most conclusive and far-reaching illustration is to be found in the famous controversy which now began to agitate theologians, concerning Divine Grace and its operation. So long as God occupied the whole background, and man, though endowed with free will and the power to do right and wrong, was little more considered than as an item in the divine ordination, it was natural that the *praemotio physica* theory—based on the fact of God's absolute dominion over our being and action—should scarcely be questioned. St. Augustine had little else in mind; little else could have occurred to him. Even St. Thomas had not yet reached the time when he needed to speak with less ambiguity, or with a more definite distinction of terms, than he did. But when the fact of man began to loom larger, when it became more observed that the greater glory of God depended much on man's own perfection, and that this perfection depended much on man himself and his own co-operation, then it was inevitable that a new, modifying suggestion would be made. In the matter of his own salvation more stress would be laid on man's own responsibility, more importance would be attached to the use he chose to make of the graces offered to him. From the mere trend of thought at the time the Molinist explanation of the working of grace was inevitable; room had to be made for man's free concurrence.

What has hitherto been said illustrates in part the psychological change that was brought about in the Church by the influence of the humanistic movement. There followed a practical evolution. It was no longer sufficient for a man only to worship and adore; he must do something to make of himself the best human being that he could. This life, and perfection in this life, began more to concern him. And that not only in regard to himself; he must do what he could to produce the same in others. More was now made of the Second Commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; not for its own sake only, but because it was akin to, of the same kind as, the fulfilment of, a necessary sequel to, the First. One could not love God without also loving man; one could best serve God by serving one's neighbour. We have the beginnings in St. Francis of Assisi, but with him it was still a negative movement. He learnt, and then taught the world, that the beginning of perfection was to put away what came between itself and God. Later Saints became more positive. The opening of schools, the founding of universities, the building of hospitals, the missionary enterprises, the cultivation of the arts and sciences, the distinct acceptance that the glories of this world should be made to redound to the glory of their Maker, all these mark a second influence of humanism on the outlook and life of the Church.

Thus alongside of the change in spiritual writing, of which we have already spoken, there came a change in the very type of the saints, and of sanctity itself. It was no longer the age of St. Bruno or St. Bernard, of St. Thomas or St. Bonaventure; it was the age of the great popular preachers, St. Vincent Ferrer (1419), St. Bernadine of Siena (1444), St. John Capistran (1456), Savonarola (1498), Geiler (1510), and many more. It was the age when new ideas began to crystallize concerning the scope of religious life; witness the Jesuati of St. John Columbini, devoted to the care of the sick, and the Brothers of the Common Life, who took no vows, but bound themselves to the education of the young. On all sides there was the same reaching out to do good to others, preparing the way for the still greater reconstruction of religious life in the sixteenth century.

There remains a third point to be considered. Humanism had its inevitable reaction. The effort after perfection, whether in the natural or in the supernatural order, and the failures that followed or were encountered as results, could

not but lead to many questionings. It began to be asked: Was man, even nature, chiefly or essentially good or bad? Men fell back on St. Augustine, in whose emphatic language both sides found support. On the one side we have the "reformers," reaching their climax in Luther and Calvin, who affirmed the essential corruption of human nature; inside the Church for a time that same theory is represented by the Jansenists. At the opposite extreme was that naturalistic optimism, which would see no evil in nature, nothing more than undevelopment. Let nature only grow, in knowledge and the use of knowledge, and it will grow in perfection; to such a school there was soon no use for God. Lutheran pessimism, rationalistic optimism, were the excrescences of the humanistic movement; if Luther revolted against the Church, he revolted against humanism no less.

Between these two, the naturally optimistic and, if it may be so called, the supernaturally pessimistic, the Church took a middle course; but in so doing altered her perspective yet further. She no longer countenanced, in opposition to the vice of the pagan world around her, the protesting example of a Simon Stylites; even the hermit in the desert, and the recluse walled up in his cell outside the village, were less and less to be found. The world was evil; that she did not contradict. Nevertheless there was a change. The optimistic tendency of the humanists, the striving for the earthly betterment of man, and therefore the belief in his capability of betterment, drew spiritual writers to look more and more at this side of human nature. The reaction against the pessimistic outlook of Luther, Calvin, and the Jansenists only served to emphasize the impression.

Examples of this new front we see in the theology of the time; in more careful distinctions concerning original sin and its effects, saving St. Augustine from the crude conclusions drawn from his words by his would-be followers; in more sympathetic discernment as to the salvation of men; in a general increase of confidence in the mercy of God, as against the older attitude of fear, culminating later in the devotion to the Sacred Heart. We see it also in a new orientation towards the practice of the spiritual life. Though the austerity of the older order still remained, and it was necessary that it should remain, nevertheless the marked growth of gentleness in manners, the greater refinement in ordinary intercourse, the closer relations of men with men in social life,

all had their material effect. The new religious orders tended to make less of exterior mortification, at least as an obligation of rule; instead they dwelt more on the interior, on the curbing of self from within, as making more for the perfection of man living among men. Perfection was no longer an opposition to evil; it was a positive thing in itself.

In these three ways, then, in a more intimate appreciation and psychological study of the individual man, a practical desire to help him, and a growing realization of the good that is in him if it can only be laid bare, the humanistic movement between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries found its expression in the life of the Church. When we now come to examine the question proposed at the beginning of this essay, perhaps the solution is less difficult. Let us repeat it briefly. In Bellarmine and St. Francis de Sales, who died almost within a year of each other, we have two great and holy men, in character not strikingly different, with like talents, with a like education, yet whose careers seem to belong to quite other generations. Bellarmine was known all the world over as the theologian of his day; Francis de Sales governed a little diocese in a little corner of Europe. Bellarmine wrote works of theology which have been a bulwark of the Church for three hundred years; Francis de Sales wrote two modest books on the spiritual life. Bellarmine was a university professor, a theological counsellor to the Pope; Francis de Sales founded a little order of women, and was chiefly engaged in guiding the consciences of men and women living in the world. Nevertheless, Francis de Sales was beatified within forty years of his death; Bellarmine but a year or two ago. After mature judgment, tested by two hundred years of experience, Francis de Sales was declared a Doctor of the Church; Bellarmine still awaits that title. Four hundred years before, the opposite might not improbably have been the case. Bellarmine might have been canonized forthwith; Francis de Sales might never have been known.

What would we suggest as the explanation? Bellarmine, though by no means uninfluenced by the humanistic movement, as his theological attitude from first to last shows, still represented the theological literature of the Church; Francis de Sales, consciously or unconsciously, was a humanist of humanists. Bellarmine wrote and laboured for the Universal Church, for the truth itself as apart from man; Francis de Sales looked to the individual soul, and in doing so found

himself helping countless others. Bellarmine expounded and defended great doctrines; Francis de Sales taught men how they might live their ordinary lives and yet rise to heights of sanctity. Bellarmine, with his truly great vision, which is perhaps his most characteristic feature as a theologian, faced the whole world with his argument; Francis de Sales had his eye upon life as it passed before him in his streets, analysed it with that psychology which his generation had learnt, encouraged that practical desire for better things which had become everywhere awakened, showed in men and women, even notoriously wicked men and women, a faith and a hope which refused ever to be discouraged. He is a Doctor of the Church not, perhaps, for any new weapon he has added to the Church's armoury; that we may hope will be the honour to be given in time to Bellarmine. He is a Doctor of the Church because, better than anyone before him, he has caught hold of the natural goodness of man, lifted it up to the highest Christian standard, shown how Christian perfection is within reach of all, in their own everyday lives, in their everyday affairs, without the sacrifice either of the supernatural on the one side or of anything good in the natural on the other. He is the Doctor of Catholic humanism.

But now we may go a step further. To mark a contrast between two great masters, each of whom in his own sphere had done a great and indispensable work, may not in itself mean much; it is more to realize that each in his own way represents the whole religious outlook of modern Europe. While the soul of the Church, and her immortal tradition remains for ever unchanged, growing from within like a mighty tree in which all the birds of the air will ultimately find a home; on the outside, in dealing with men, her countenance changes according to time, and place, and circumstance. In all religions there have always been, and always will be, two dangers; at one extreme the stiffening into formalism, paralysis of mind and soul, at the other an excessive individualism, whereby every man is a religion to himself. The eastern religions, pagan and Christian alike, are a sufficient example of the first; the second is seen in the theory, if not in the practice, of the Protestant reaction.

Against these two dangers Bellarmine and St. Francis were the safeguards of their day. Bellarmine took hold of the ancient tradition, and brought it into line with his time. Francis de Sales took the new individualism, cherished it as

it deserved to be cherished, saw and taught how the individual made perfect increased the glory of God, linked together the old and the new without that drastic cleavage which the Reformation had made. And on that account he has won his popularity; he has succeeded where Luther and his following have failed. He is a saint, not of the Catholic Church only, but also of men outside. Often his name is welcome among them; not seldom his "Introduction to a Devout Life" is reprinted, far more often than anything from the pen of Luther. While James I. of England was destroying the faith and tradition that Francis represented, Francis himself was writing his meek little book at Annecy; now when all the turmoil is over it is the book of Francis, not the edicts of James, that men most gladly recognize as their own. Martin Luther had declared the utter wickedness and corruption of human nature, and through Calvin, through the Jansenists, through our own Puritans, through John Knox and his Covenanters, his followers had carried out his teaching. Francis de Sales came, and in his quiet way told men that human nature was worthy of a better judgment; it was not wholly corrupt, it was capable of indefinite perfection. And to-day, everywhere, Francis is believed and followed; Luther, Calvin, Knox, are practically discarded. If since the fifteenth century the Catholic Church has taken on a new orientation, Protestantism has done no less; and of the two it is Protestantism that has made the greater change. In this at least the two now look in one direction, in this there is unity. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" is the beginning of a new wisdom, soon, it is to be hoped, to bring unity in the practice of that other commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God."

For conversion is not only a matter of dogma. There are those who will freely say that they believe everything the Catholic Church teaches, yet are they as far from her as any infidel; nay, because of their very knowledge they are farther away. There are others, Christians as well as unbelievers, whose dogma is all askew, whose knowledge of the Faith is very primitive, yet who think on every point with St. Francis de Sales. In this way at least the unbelieving world of Europe is more Christian than it was four hundred years ago; along this road the world of the Reformation has made long strides towards reunion. The Scribe of the Temple has again questioned Christ. He has been struck by the answer:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God; thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." He has reflected and has answered: "Rabbi, thou hast spoken well." And he has received his assuring encouragement: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God."

What then yet remains? Even of that the signs are hopeful. For there is no self-perfection that can stand alone; there is no love possible that centres on itself. Both must go out to others; both must wish to make others perfect and lovable. Doing that, they are in need of an ideal; and the search for an ideal brings the best that is in the world more and more together round the feet of God. If the times are more godless, they are also more Godly. Men do not now condemn the Middle Ages; they do not ridicule the mystic; he is behind his age who makes a mockery of the worship of God. To many He may be unknown, but He is not far from those who haply feel after Him; and those who feel after Him are far more numerous to-day than they were in the days of Luther. More than that; they feel after him with human hearts, through the means of good works offered to Him, with a hope that is founded on faith however dim; not, as Luther would have had them believe, from hearts corrupt, whose good works were of no worth, whose hope depended only on a doom. They have left Luther far behind. As we have said, the world to-day is more Catholic than it knows, in the spirit both of St. Francis de Sales and of Blessed Robert Bellarmine.

✠ ALBAN GOODIER.

PITT AND THE CATHOLICS

NO man played a more decisive part in the abolition of the penal system and in preparing the way for complete Catholic Emancipation than did William Pitt. It is the paradox of his career that, although he effectively prevented the Irish Parliament from admitting Catholics as legislators, when it was willing and ready to do so in 1795, it was he also who forced the Irish Parliament to carry the sweeping concessions of 1793 which virtually wiped out most of the penal code in Ireland. In England, he not only assisted in the passing of the Catholic Relief Act of 1791 but helped to smooth over the differences that arose over the proposed discrimination between Papists and "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." He fell from power at the height of his prestige, expressly because of the King's objection to his proposal to follow the Act of Union by the admission of Catholics to Parliament. Yet when he resumed office again, he not only refused to renew his efforts to carry Catholic Emancipation, but informed the delegates from Ireland, who presented the Catholic petition, that he would himself oppose it if it were presented from any other quarter.

It is not surprising that a record which was so dominated by political opportunism should have given rise to bitter accusations of betrayal. It is idle now to debate whether or not Pitt could have overridden the objections of the King in regard to admitting Catholics to Parliament, when he had successfully overridden him on other questions. But no study of the Emancipation struggle can ignore the violent changes of policy towards Catholics on Pitt's part; and it may help to illuminate the tangled story to examine the various stages of his relations with the English and the Irish Catholics.

In Husenbeth's "Life of Bishop Milner" there are several curious passages which reveal the extent to which Pitt seriously attempted to understand the Catholic question. When Milner published his "Statement of Facts relating to the Contest among the Roman Catholics of this Kingdom, concerning the Bill to be introduced into Parliament for their Relief" in 1791, he had his pamphlet distributed, with his usual energy, among members of Parliament. He was still only a priest at Winchester, but his pamphlet was quoted by the Attorney General, Sir Archibald Macdonald, during the de-

bate, and Pitt read the document himself. He is alleged to have said after reading it that "we have been deceived in the great outline of the business; and either the Papists shall be relieved or the Protestant Catholic Dissenters shall not gain their ends." He had also received a long letter from Mr. Thomas Weld at Lulworth, urging Milner's objections very strongly and requesting him to disregard the claims of the Catholic Committee to represent the Catholic body. And, being naturally perplexed by these conflicting statements among the Catholic spokesmen he apparently decided to make his own investigations. Husenbeth records as "proof of Mr. Pitt's slender acquaintance with the real belief of Catholics," that "he was seen one day about this time, to go into the shop of Coghlan, the Catholic bookseller, and purchase a little Catechism, which he read attentively as he walked away down the street." Not every Prime Minister would have taken even that amount of trouble in dealing with a very small body of men who were apparently unable to work together!

He had shown similar evidence of an intelligent interest in the real doctrines of the Catholics before the Bill of 1791 was yet drafted. Pitt met the deputation of English Catholic laymen with a request that they should furnish replies from the leading Catholic Universities as to the teaching of the Church in regard to the deposing power of the Pope. He was personally acquainted with Mr. Fermor, who became the recognized intermediary between the Committee and the Prime Minister, as well as with Mr. Weld, who distrusted the Committee and was an intimate friend of Milner. There were special reasons for paying attention to Mr. Weld, for George III. had already been to stay as a guest at Lulworth. Moreover, Mr. Weld's brother had been the first husband of Mrs. Fitzherbert, who, having been secretly married to the Prince of Wales in 1785, was now living openly with him. If Pitt had been merely an opportunist, seeking means of avoiding any controversial question by playing off one party against another, he could very easily have shelved the Catholic Relief Bill on the ground that so much disagreement existed among the Catholics. But when the replies came from the Universities of Paris, Louvain, Douai, Alcala, Valladolid, and Salamanca, he made good use of them in assuring the King that neither the Pope nor any body of men claimed to have any civil authority or power of jurisdiction whatever

in England, or to absolve any of the King's subjects from their oath of allegiance, and that there was nothing in the Catholic Faith to justify not keeping faith with heretics.

There were other much stronger reasons, moreover, which urged Pitt to take a real interest in the Catholic question. In 1791 England was not yet at war with France, but the Revolution had advanced so far that it had become urgently necessary to cultivate closer relations with Catholic countries who viewed events in France with alarm. The Revolution soon developed into an open attack upon all religion, and priests and nuns as well as royalists came flocking to England as refugees. Towards them, even the King was showing marked friendliness; and after the September massacres he associated himself with an appeal signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to raise funds for their relief. The Prince of Wales even went in person to welcome a destitute community of French nuns who had arrived at Brighton; and he paid their expenses, besides arranging for their transport to London. And in the same year George III. had gone for his third visit to Lulworth, and had been making sympathetic inquiries as to the success of Mr. Weld's efforts to assist the exiled priests and nuns.

In such an atmosphere, the difficulties of granting political relief to the Catholics had greatly diminished. An unexpected opportunity for a bold stroke occurred when Pitt found that the Irish Parliament had refused to grant the Catholic demands for the suffrage. No aspect of the question was more important than the problem of getting recruits for the army in case war should become inevitable. Many might be hoped for from Ireland, and besides, the arrival of refugees from the Irish Brigade, who had been disbanded in the early years of the Revolution, forced on Pitt's attention the desirability of removing the obstacles to giving commissions to Catholic officers of such tried worth.

A scarcely less important consideration, while the war clouds were gathering, was the constant friction between the Irish Parliament and the Government in London. Ever since the right to legislative independence had been won by Grattan and the Irish Volunteers in 1782, the question had been a continual source of trouble. And although Pitt had succeeded in overriding the Irish Parliament on various occasions, with the support of the King—whose supremacy the Irish Volunteers had never challenged—there was no knowing

what new controversy might arise. With war on the horizon the possibility of a serious conflict between the two Parliaments was a constant anxiety. Any idea of extinguishing the Irish Parliament altogether, so soon after it had vindicated its claim to independence, was as yet wildly impracticable. Actually, however, the Catholic agitation in Ireland gave Pitt a wholly unexpected opportunity to assert his superior authority. In 1792 the Irish Catholics had developed their agitation so successfully that the Protestant Parliament found it necessary to pass a Bill, introduced by Sir Hercules Langrishe, which removed some of the outstanding disabilities, by the legal recognition of mixed marriages and admitting Catholics to the professions. But the Catholics, stimulated to renewed and more vigorous activity by the triumphant example of the popular revolt in France, had continued to press for admission to the elective franchise. This the Irish Parliament flatly refused; and within a very short time after passing Langrishe's Relief Bill, they rejected with contumely the petition for admission to the franchise which had been presented in most deferential terms by the Catholic leaders, and which was even supported by another petition in their favour from the Dissenters of Belfast. Both petitions were removed with deliberate insult from the table of the Irish House of Commons, and the Catholic leaders decided at once to appeal from the Irish Parliament direct to the King.

Through the summer and autumn of 1792 the Catholics were busy organizing a National Convention of delegates from all parts of the country, with the intention of repeating in Ireland very much the same procedure which had been followed by the States General in France. They had prudently obtained the highest legal assurance that no one could prevent their assembling for the express purpose of presenting a petition to the King. The Protestant Grand Juries were enraged at this temerity, and issued blood-curdling resolutions threatening armed resistance to the Catholic claims. But Pitt, watching his own opportunity, impressed strongly upon the Viceroy that the Catholic Convention must not be prevented from assembling. The direct authority of the English Prime Minister in regard to the Irish Parliament since 1782 had been greatly limited; but in the last resort he had direct access to the King, as well as to the King's representative, the Viceroy. Writing to Lord Westmorland, Pitt deliberately deplored the absence of any conciliatory disposi-

tion on the part of the Irish Government, and declared his belief that it had become impossible to continue indefinitely in the prevailing attitude of resistance to any concession.

Accordingly, when the deputation from the Irish Convention, headed by the Dublin draper, John Keogh, arrived in London to present the Catholic petition to the King in person, Pitt made sure that it should be favourably received. Afterwards, when they had to negotiate direct with Dundas and Pitt, they found to their astonishment that Pitt insisted that they should be given far more than they ever expected. Pitt not only promised them the suffrage, but insisted that they should have the forty-shilling franchise. In spite of the entreaties of Henry Grattan, Lord Donoughmore and other Protestant sympathizers who had come to London to assist Keogh, Pitt was determined to humiliate the Irish Parliament by compelling them to grant more than they had been asked to give.

Keogh and his friends were so astonished by the success of their mission to London that they dissolved the Catholic Committee, and announced that any further agitation, even to secure the admission of Catholics as legislators, would be an act of ingratitude towards the King who had saved them from their Protestant oppressors. Throughout 1794, therefore, the Irish Catholics were politically quiescent, but during the year events were developing in London which affected Pitt's policy profoundly. The need for Irish recruits for the army had become really urgent; and the overtures made by the disbanded officers of the Irish Brigade—particularly by Colonel Count O'Connell, the uncle of the future Liberator—were now definitely accepted. Various plans had been considered for utilizing their services, and Count O'Connell had even been ready to take part in a desperate invasion of France, so as to disorganize the Revolutionary armies. But all these schemes failed to materialize, and the reconstituted Irish Brigade was eventually sent in 1795 to serve in the West Indies, where many of the young officers, including Count O'Connell's own nephew, soon died of fever. Meanwhile, dramatic political changes had taken place in London under the stress of war. A section of the Whigs had seceded, formed a coalition with Pitt, and were represented in the Government. As a result, Earl Fitzwilliam was appointed to succeed Lord Westmorland as Viceroy in Ireland.

The appointment, coming after the other signs of Royal

and Governmental favour mentioned above, was looked on as a definite indication that the policy of the Government towards the Catholics had finally changed from oppression to conciliation. Westmorland had been deliberately unfriendly to the Irish Catholics. He had even refused to accept an address of loyalty from the Catholics of Munster, on the ground that the last paragraph of their address expressed hopes of relief from their disabilities. But now the whole prospect was transformed. Fitzwilliam was well known to be a strong advocate of full Catholic emancipation, and the Prince of Wales was in intimate alliance with Fox and the bolder spirits among the Whigs, who demanded Catholic emancipation on principle rather than as a matter of expediency. In such circumstances, the ambition of the Irish Catholics revived at once, and they renewed their demand for full emancipation. By the time that Fitzwilliam arrived in Dublin the concession was universally regarded as inevitable. Even the Irish Parliament had become convinced of the necessity to give way.

Fitzwilliam's instructions bade him damp down any controversial agitation until European peace was restored. But he understood that, if he found that concession was inevitable, Pitt would back him in sanctioning Catholic emancipation. As it was, owing to the delay in his arrival, the situation had already got out of hand. Within a few weeks he was writing urgently to London to say that he found it impossible to delay emancipation any longer if the Government was to derive any credit for a concession which in any case could not be withheld. Pitt, however, never replied to his repeated requests for guidance. The situation had become really urgent, for Grattan had presented a petition with half a million signatures demanding the admission of Catholics to Parliament. Fitzwilliam, therefore, decided that Pitt meant him to use his own discretion, and he gave leave to Grattan to introduce his Emancipation Bill. The Irish Parliament was actually prepared to pass it, when the Viceroy suddenly received orders from London that no further concessions to the Catholics were to be allowed. Fitzwilliam was furious, pointing out the fatal consequences that must follow a refusal to sanction reforms which had become inevitable, and which he believed himself to have had full authority to allow. An angry correspondence ensued, which resulted within a few weeks in Fitzwilliam's sudden recall. He left Dublin with its

streets draped in mourning, and was escorted to his boat by all the most prominent citizens. With his departure an entirely new regime was ushered in.

The inner history of that bewildering episode, which resulted in postponing Catholic Emancipation for more than thirty years, will always continue to be hotly debated. But the main facts are clear enough. The appointment of such a man in such circumstances was an implicit undertaking to grant Emancipation. What caused so sudden and so complete a reversal of policy? Fitzwilliam himself has given a perfectly simple explanation of what occurred, and the sequel lends strong confirmation to his theory. Besides trying to create a conciliatory atmosphere he had attempted to reform "Dublin Castle," and actually had dismissed one of its chief officials. Consequently the Beresford faction, who had hitherto held a monopoly of power and patronage, determined at once to get rid of this reformer. They had rushed to London to mobilize every possible influence against Fitzwilliam, and at the same time the Irish Lord Chancellor, Fitzgibbon, went over to have a long interview with Pitt, and succeeded in putting the Irish situation before him in a new light. It is easy to dismiss the whole story, as Fitzwilliam explained it afterwards in private letters, as a fantastic imagination. But the only alternative is simply to assume that Pitt for no ostensible reason suddenly changed his policy and made Fitzwilliam's efforts to further it an excuse for recalling him. No one, however, least of all a statesman of Pitt's calibre, acts without motive. Lord Fitzgibbon, fearful for Protestant Ascendancy, was able to supply one.

For years Pitt had been harassed by the independent attitude of the Irish Parliament, so much so that he had punished them by making them consent to a democratic franchise for their Catholic population. Now, as the war grew more serious, the need of unity seemed to him to grow. Hereupon comes Fitzgibbon to put before him a programme that would rid him of anxiety for ever, and to convince him that with firmness it could be accomplished. Fitzgibbon had assured him that it would be possible to extinguish the Irish Parliament altogether, if all further concessions were refused and if the Catholics could thus be made to realize how bigoted and irresponsible an assembly the Irish Parliament really was. That, quite simply, was Fitzgibbon's proposal; and

Pitt, with his mind fixed upon the war with France, was much more concerned to rid England of the danger of divided counsels than to emancipate the Catholics. The whole subsequent story shows that he decided to sacrifice the Catholic question to the more urgent problem of eliminating all possible causes of weakness while the war lasted.

For that decision responsibility must always rest with Pitt. From the point of view of a Protestant Prime Minister, confronted with a European war, his decision can be understood, if not admired. But it involved much more than the postponement of Catholic Emancipation. The old bigoted ascendancy was reinstated in Dublin Castle; and the sequel showed with what vindictive determination they took their revenge upon the Catholics who had dared to challenge their authority. Fitzgibbon, although he was a Protestant of the narrowest views, saw much further than the officials in the Castle who had been outraged by Fitzwilliam's reforming zeal. He saw that, growing in numbers, wealth and influence the Catholic population were bound in the near future to overthrow Protestant Ascendancy if supported only by a native Parliament. Ireland would inevitably become a Catholic country, with a Catholic Parliament and Government, unless the Irish Parliament could be induced to abdicate its powers in favour of Protestant England and abandon all those romantic conceptions of national independence, wherewith the Patriot group under Grattan's leadership had caused so much disturbance during the past dozen years. To expect such a body of men to vote the extinction of Parliament for which they had claimed sovereign rights might well seem impossible. But Fitzgibbon knew the conditions and faced them with callous unscrupulousness in the interests of the Ascendancy itself. A very few great borough-owners controlled the effective majority of votes, and Fitzgibbon was confident that these few great landowners could be bribed by titles or by money to do what he desired.

It took five years for his plans to reach their accomplishment; and in the interval he had to make sure that the Irish Parliament would show itself so implacably hostile to the mass of the people that those misgoverned multitudes would rejoice in its extinction. The rebellion of 1798 was the direct outcome of years of relentless and deliberate oppression, playing into the hands of the revolutionary secret societies that drew their inspiration from the French Revolu-

tion. Not until after the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, as the leaders of the United Irishmen Society themselves avowed afterwards, was it possible for them to make any real headway among the people. But after Pitt had recalled Fitzwilliam and given Fitzgibbon a free hand, revolution in Ireland became more and more inevitable. It was a great risk to take; and at least once a French military expedition was only prevented by bad weather from actually landing in a thoroughly discontented Ireland. But Fitzgibbon had counted all the cost, and had foreseen all eventualities. The rebellion, when it came, struck the last blow at the tottering authority of the Irish Parliament. Troops had to be summoned urgently from England, and the Irish Parliament had to confess its own impotence to govern the country unaided. Fitzgibbon had played for great stakes and had completely won. In the aftermath of the rebellion he was able to tell the Irish Parliament his own contempt for it as plainly as any man ever spoke to any assembly. He pointed out its abject failure either to maintain order or to meet the wishes of the people, and in the final appeal to the self-interest of its members he insisted that the Ascendancy could now be maintained only by their carrying an Act of Union which would imply a full confession of their own incompetence.

In the five years between Fitzwilliam's recall and the Act of Union, Pitt's hands were too full with the war with France to pay much attention to what was happening in Ireland. But he had given Fitzgibbon a free hand, and at the same time he had urged forward the other aspect of his new Irish policy. The proposal to gain control over the Catholic clergy in Ireland by making them salaried dependants of the Government had long been considered, and Pitt decided to make a start by endowing an Irish seminary with public money. Even the meagre grant for building the College at Maynooth gave him direct access to the Irish bishops and compelled the ten bishops (including the four archbishops) who were its trustees to cultivate friendly relations with the Government. Fitzgibbon had always disliked the scheme, and he refused absolutely to tolerate any permanent endowment, so that the bishops should have to present their requests for financial assistance from year to year. By the end of 1795 the seminary had been started; and after the rebellion of 1798 it was possible to use the Maynooth trustees as a channel of regular communication with the Catholic body.

The rebellion had been suppressed with such fierce reprisals against the Catholics, and with the burning of so many Catholic chapels, that the bishops were thoroughly intimidated by the time young Lord Castlereagh, as the new Irish Secretary, undertook to negotiate with them concerning their attitude towards the proposed Act of Union. The negotiations required infinite tact and firmness. Castlereagh was well aware that the Catholics would realize that, with the disappearance of the Irish Parliament, they would lose all prospect of gaining that control of the Irish Government to which their superiority of numbers entitled them. In a letter to London he wrote plainly that the only policy must be to impress upon the Catholics that nothing would be granted to them except on condition that the Union went through, and that the Union would then be made the prelude to their emancipation.

As the critical stages arrived, Pitt was kept constantly in touch with what was developing, and he gave his fullest support to the negotiations conducted by Castlereagh and the new Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis. Their diplomacy made marvellous progress, and the Irish bishops and practically all the Catholic leaders had very quickly been won over. It was secretly agreed that the endowment of Maynooth should be made permanent, and the promises of Catholic Emancipation as an integral part of the Union settlement became more and more definite. Even Grattan's vehement appeals to national pride could make no impression against the complete confidence which the promises and the friendly attitude of Castlereagh and Cornwallis had inspired. The Union was carried by a safe majority, and the Irish Parliament went out of existence, while the Irish bishops were already convinced not only that Catholic Emancipation would follow at once, but that the Catholic Church would become almost an Established Church on practically the same footing as the Protestant Church of Ireland. How far, if at all, Pitt's lieutenants in Ireland exceeded their powers will never be known. But the pledges given by both Castlereagh and Cornwallis could scarcely have gone further. Castlereagh went over to London when the work was done, and left Cornwallis contemplating with ecstasy the extraordinary achievement that had been carried through, without public disorder and at the cost of no more than the bribes paid to the supporters of the Union in the Irish Parliament. He was

already congratulating himself on having procured Catholic Emancipation as well as carrying the Union, when he received from Castlereagh the first intimation that their pledges were not to be fulfilled.

The day of reckoning had come, and Pitt had been at once confronted in the Cabinet with the opposition which he had counted upon breaking down. The Lord Chancellor had been outraged by the suggestion, and had gone straight to the King, besides mobilizing the Archbishops of Canterbury and of Armagh to protest against any idea of emancipating the Catholics. The King had heard rumours of Castlereagh's bargain, and declared openly that it was "the most jacobinical thing he had ever heard of." Pitt, faced with a split in his own Cabinet and with the intrigue of the Lord Chancellor to frustrate his policy, found that his hand had been forced, and was compelled to take a firm line before his preparations were complete. He sent what was almost an ultimatum to the King. The immediate result was a breakdown in the King's health which made all further progress impossible for the time being. Pitt wrote an apology to the King, announcing that he would leave the matter entirely alone. But before his apology had been even considered, George III. had formed a new administration under Addington. Pitt, Castlereagh, and Cornwallis all resigned, and Cornwallis solemnly informed the Irish Catholics that the resignation of the Prime Minister was directly due to sympathy with their own cause, and that not one of the Ministers who had resigned would take office again unless they could carry Catholic Emancipation. Almost immediately he was obliged to repudiate what he had said and to let the Catholics know that their cause was not really considered to be of any special importance. The bargain over the Act of Union had been a complete disaster to the Catholic leaders. And for four years, while Pitt remained out of office, the Irish bishops could only contemplate the failure of their own policy and thank heaven that they had at least been freed from the necessity of acting up to the agreement which the ten trustees of Maynooth had made, to accept salaries from the Government and thus lose their independence.

Four years later, with Napoleon's armies triumphing all over Europe, Pitt was recalled as Prime Minister once again. At last the Irish Catholics believed that their hour of retribution had come, and they sent a deputation to him to request

that he should now promote their cause. They desired him to present a petition on their behalf; but in case he should feel unable to do so, they requested that he should entrust its presentation to someone else. In the last resort, they asked only that he should accept their petition and allow it to lie on the table of the House. But Pitt's preoccupation with the war had made him entirely indifferent to the Catholics' sense of grievance. He told them plainly that, owing to the objections of the King, he would himself feel obliged to oppose any Catholic petition that might be presented. Fox gladly presented it for them, but was hopelessly outvoted. And Pitt's last action in regard to Catholic Emancipation was to oppose the petition of 1805. Ten years before, he had led the Irish Catholics to believe that Emancipation was imminent. For years he had believed firmly in its necessity. He had been forced to leave office when he was most needed as the result of the bargain with the Catholics over the Act of Union. But in the end he had decided to leave the question entirely alone.

He had used the Catholic cause as a pawn in his political game. The forces of Protestant intolerance which he aroused by proposing that an English Parliament should grant what an Irish Parliament had refused made him quail. Yet the reasons for Emancipation were overwhelming, even from the point of view of expediency; and the Concordat between Napoleon and the Pope, which was represented as an argument against Emancipation, was just as strong an argument in its favour at the time. But to have championed Catholic Emancipation against the prejudices of a half-mad King and in the teeth of Protestant opposition would have meant risking popularity to an extent which only a really high-principled politician could be expected to face. And although Pitt was one of the first of the Tories to see the political expedience of removing the Catholic disabilities, and although he did much to remove them, yet he had not enough love of justice to risk his political position by being the champion of Catholic rights. For the long postponement of Catholic Emancipation after 1795 he must bear full responsibility.

DENIS GWYNN.

THE PASSION OF SS. PERPETUA AND FELICITAS

AMONG the literary remains of the first Christian centuries which are of importance for the historian is the large collection of documents known under the general title of "Acts of the Martyrs." These Acts are, however, by no means of equal value or reliability. They may be divided into two classes. First there are the Acts properly so called, that is to say the exact, or nearly exact transcription of the judicial *procès-verbaux*, drawn up by the pagan officials and sold to the Christians. The official accounts thus obtained would seem generally to have been revised and given a pious setting before being circulated among the faithful. This class of Acts is of great value and generally very trustworthy. One of the best examples of the type is the *Acta Proconsularia S. Cypriani*. But in addition to these precious documents, which are far from numerous, there are extant a great number of accounts of the sufferings and death of the martyrs which, though often given the name of Acts, should more properly be called *Passiones* or *Gesta Martyrum*. These *Passiones* are recognized as of very unequal value. Allard quotes from an eleventh century manuscript the following judgment: "The Passions of the holy martyrs are of less reliability [than the Acts] because many of them contain a mixture of truth and falsehood. In some there is little truth, in others there is little falsehood. But a very small number of them is entirely true." Recent archaeological discoveries, however, have made it possible in many cases to test the truth of these accounts, and not infrequently even the most suspect documents have been proved by this means to contain a surprising amount of historical fact.

Among the *Passiones* one of the most valuable and beautiful pieces remaining to us is the *Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, an African document of the year 212.¹

The African Church was at this time suffering under the new legislation of Septimius Severus, which had profoundly

¹ An English translation called *The Passion of St. Perpetua*, with Introduction and Notes, has lately been composed by the Rev. R. Waterville Muncey, M.A., and published by Messrs. Dent & Sons, at 3s. 6d. n. Besides a scholarly version, it provides all that is necessary for the understanding of text and setting.

affected the status of the Christians. To the haphazard persecution of the first century had succeeded the policy defined by Trajan, the first emperor who expressly recognized that to be a Christian was in itself a punishable offence. His rescript to Pliny on the matter is well known. Pliny had written to the emperor asking him what course he was to pursue when Christians were brought before him, and setting forth his own doubts and difficulties in the matter. To him the Christians did not seem to be guilty of any crime: "I found nothing but a base and extravagant superstition . . . and I was in no small doubt . . . if it were the name itself, even though free from crime, that merited punishment, or the crimes that cling to the name." Trajan's reply is famous: *Conquirendi non sunt*. Christians were not to be sought for. If they were accused and convicted of being Christians they were to be punished, but if they sacrificed to the gods, even though they had been Christians in the past, they were to be pardoned. Above all, no anonymous denunciations were to be received, "*nam et pessimi exempli, nec nostri saeculi est*"—that would be an evil precedent, ill befitting the times. As the Christians in those early days belonged in very large part to the lower orders, the hatred of which they were the object was largely confined to the same class. The common people would be slow to appear before the magistrates' tribunals as accusers, hence this clause in Trajan's rescript to Pliny must have been a help to the Christians. Tertullian mentions how the proconsul Pudens acted on it in the case of a Christian brought before him.

Trajan's orders to Pliny show a well-thought-out, though not very consistent policy, a definite attitude adopted towards the Christians. It would be interesting to know what motives dictated this policy, on what grounds Trajan decided that the *nomen ipsum Christianum* was a crime, and why, granting that it was such, Christians were not to be officially ferreted out.¹ Whatever the answers to these questions may be, the fact remains that the policy of Trajan was the policy of his successors throughout the second century. The general idea was that the Christians were enemies of the gods and disloyal subjects, but the heavy hand of the law fell upon them only when popular hatred or private enmity summoned them before the tribunals of the Empire.

¹ The anomaly did not escape Tertullian's eagle eye. In the *Apology* he directs keen shafts at the inconsistency and injustice of the policy.

The beginning of the third century inaugurates a new period in the history of the persecutions, a period of active persecution by imperial edict. Christianity could no longer be despised. It had become a force to be reckoned with. Its adherents were everywhere, in the forum and in the camp, in the palace and the council-chamber. They were a numerous body forming a large percentage of the population of the Empire,¹ taking an active part in its everyday life, exercising an influence the extent of which could hardly be gauged. The passive attitude of Trajan and his successors could no longer be maintained. Roman traditions and Roman religion must either bow to Christianity and suffer extinction or overcome and destroy this menace to the gods of Rome and to the prosperity and permanence of Rome itself.² Hence the persecutions of the third century, especially from Decius onwards, were directed not merely towards the repression of Christianity, but to its entire extermination. But Christianity had within itself a principle of life which no violence could crush or kill. The waves of persecution spent themselves in orgies of blood, and the Church was left, wounded sometimes indeed, but still full of energy and life, emerging from successive trials purified and stronger than before, marching triumphantly on its path to final victory.

The first change, then, in the policy of Trajan was made by Severus, to the great detriment of the Christians, for the time being at any rate. In the year 202, while travelling in Palestine, he issued an edict forbidding under serious penalties all Jewish and Christian propaganda.³ With regard to the Jews this edict remained practically a dead letter. Certainly the Jews continued to enjoy the favour of the authorities, for we read in the "Digest" that the "Divine Severus

¹ Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.*, 37, where is found the famous passage, *Hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus*. The statements of Tertullian in this matter cannot be taken too literally, he was fond of hyperbole; but they must nevertheless contain a large measure of truth.

² I do not wish to imply that from the nature of the case no *modus vivendi* could have been arrived at between Christianity and the Roman government. This is abundantly disproved by the fact that during the course of the third century, while the Church suffered roughly twenty-four years of persecution, it enjoyed seventy-six years of peace, during many of which it was not merely tolerated, but gained implicit recognition, while Christians often held high official positions. The persecutions of the third century were immediately caused in many cases by motives which were petty or personal; but these in turn aroused the dormant but ever-present superstition that the welfare of Rome was identified with the practice of the ancient religion, that the neglect of the worship of the gods spelt the downfall of Rome.

³ The view that this edict forbade propaganda in Palestine only, seems untenable. Cf. Allard, "Histoire des persécutions," II., p. 59.

and Antoninus permitted those who follow the Jewish superstition to obtain public offices, but laid such charges upon them as would not wound their religious susceptibilities," and Jewish proselytism was so far winked at that it was not unknown for a Christian to turn Jew to escape persecution. For the Christians, however, it was far otherwise. The edict gave the Roman officials power to take action, apart from any formal accusation, against those who were converted to the Christian faith, and also against the instruments of their conversion. This was a severe blow, for a large part of the Christian community was composed of converts. Tertullian, indeed, with his usual dash of hyperbole, says, "Christians are not born, they are made." On the other hand, the temper of Christianity was essentially apostolic, and at a time when it was surrounded on all sides by paganism, there must have been very few of its adherents who did not in some form or other bring themselves under the ban of the emperor's edict. Moreover we may be sure that, once the authorities were empowered to take the initiative in persecution, they did not always act with that nice discrimination between Christians guilty of propaganda and those who were not which the edict implied; or if it were a case of a convert they would not be too particular in their inquiries whether the conversion had taken place before or after the edict of Severus. In many cases provincial governors made Severus' change of policy the excuse for a general persecution.

Now began for the African Church "the midday heat," as Tertullian forcibly expresses it, the very dog-star of persecution. From 202 till 212 it continued intermittently and was marked by several fierce outbursts, but the most noteworthy event during its whole course was the martyrdom of St. Perpetua with her companions Felicitas, Revocatus, Saturninus, Secundulus and Saturus, which took place at Carthage in 212. The history of this martyrdom forms the document styled *Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis*. It is clear from the account given that we have here an application of the edict of Severus, for Perpetua, Felicitas and their companions were when arrested, not yet Christians, but catechumens under the instruction of the priest Saturus. Saturus was not himself apprehended, but gave himself up later, not out of any rash desire for martyrdom, but to ensure that his converts should remain steadfast in their new-found faith.

The *Passio* purports to be largely autobiographical, part of it written by St. Perpetua herself and part of it by Saturus, while the beginning and end were composed and the whole document edited by a third party, an eyewitness of their imprisonment and suffering. Whether those parts of the recital which claim to be from the pens of St. Perpetua and Saturus are actually so or not, it is at any rate certain that the whole is a genuine contemporary account, for it was known to Tertullian and is quoted by St. Augustine. It differs from most of the other *Passiones* in that it is much more than a bald recital of the facts destined to be read in church on the anniversary of the martyrs' death. The facts are clothed in language at once beautiful and simple, and the whole piece has a literary charm and grace that mark it off at once from the great body of the *Acta* and *Passiones*. As Monceaux says: "*C'est déjà une oeuvre littéraire, non pas d'intention, mais de fait : oeuvre charmante, pleine de grâce et de vérité, un des bijoux de la vieille littérature chrétienne.*"¹

Both in prison and at her examination before the procurator Hilarianus, St. Perpetua was visited by her father, who besought and implored her to give up Christianity and not to abandon the friends who were so dear to her. The passages describing these scenes are extraordinarily touching and pathetic :

After a few days the rumour went abroad that we were to be tried. Thereupon my father came from the city, overcome with grief, and he tried to dissuade me, saying, "Have pity, my daughter, on my white hairs ; have pity on your father, if I am worthy to be called father by you. If with my own hands I have fostered your growth to the bloom of youth, if I have preferred you to all your brothers, do not disgrace me in the eyes of men. Look upon your brothers, look upon your mother and your aunt, look upon your son, who cannot live when you are gone. Be not so obstinate, or you will destroy us all ; for not one of us will dare to speak freely if you suffer." These things my father said out of his love for me, kissing my hands and throwing himself at my feet ; and with tears he called me, not "daughter," but "lady." And I grieved for the white hairs of my father, that he alone of all my family would not rejoice at my suffering ; and I consoled him, saying, "It is the will of God that will be done at that judgment seat, for we are not in our

¹ " Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne," I., p. 70.

own power, but in the hands of God." And he departed from me sadly.

Another day when we were at dinner, we were suddenly hurried away to be tried, and were brought to the forum. The rumour of our trial spread immediately throughout the neighbourhood, and an immense crowd gathered. We went up to the judgment seat. The others were questioned and confessed. When my turn came, my father appeared with my son; he drew me back and said to me in a suppliant voice, "Have pity on your child." And the procurator Hilarianus, who was then in power in the room of the proconsul Minucius Timinianus who had died, said to me: "Have pity on your father's white hairs, have pity on your infant child. Offer sacrifice for the safety of the emperors." And I answered him, "I will not sacrifice." "Are you a Christian?" he asked. I answered, "I am a Christian." And as my father still stood there to dissuade me, Hilarianus ordered him to be removed, and he was struck with a rod. And I grieved at the lot of my father, as though I had been struck myself: such was my grief for his unhappy old age. Then we were all judged, and condemned to the beasts; and we went back cheerfully to prison.¹

Even the most callous could hardly read such a passage unmoved. It has the simplicity of great art, and sketches vividly for us the characters and emotions of the actors in the drama, the simple dignity and steadfast courage of the young Christian matron, and the piteous grief, misery and despair of the grey-haired old father, who saw his best-loved daughter going of her own accord to what seemed to him a disgraceful death and a dishonoured grave.

Hilares descendimus ad carcerem: This note of joy and courage pervades the whole Passion, showing us how the Christians realized that the death of a martyr was not a tragedy but a triumph. The day of their combat dawns for them with the joyous anticipation of imminent victory: "The day of their victory dawned, and they went forth from prison to the amphitheatre as though to heaven, cheerful and bright of countenance; if they trembled, it was with joy, and not with fear. Perpetua followed with calm face and steady step, with downcast look concealing from the sight of all the brightness of her eyes."²

¹ "Passio," II., 1, 2.

² *Ibid.* VI., 1.

The fickleness of the pagan population of Carthage is well illustrated in what followed. When the martyrs were brought to the amphitheatre and were passing beneath the procurator Hilarianus they said to him, "You judge us, but God will judge you." At this the mob was enraged and clamoured that they should be scourged. Shortly afterwards Perpetua and Felicitas were stripped of their garments and put in nets to be exposed to a wild cow, but the sight of them struck the people with horror, and they were taken back and clothed. When the wild beast had failed to kill them, caprice once more took the form of pity, and the women were sent back through the Gate of the Living. Only a few minutes afterwards, however, a cry arose to have them brought back and despatched in the arena. From such a mob the Christians could expect little mercy.

The courage of the martyrs remained unflinching to the end, and Perpetua, who had all through given an example of fortitude to her companions, herself directed the erring aim of the unskilled young gladiator whose duty it was to deliver the *coup de grâce*. "Perhaps such a woman could not have been slain had she not wished it herself, for she was feared by the unclean spirit," is the comment of the Passion.

Such are a few traits of the Passion of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, one of the most illuminating and beautiful pieces of all the early Christian literature. What strikes us especially, perhaps, as we read through it, is the faith of these Christians. All the powers of the world were arrayed against them, yet they were not appalled. No torture could shake that faith, not the red-hot iron, not the scourge nor the wild beast's tooth. They looked forward with confidence and eager expectation to the day of the combat which they knew would win for them an imperishable crown.

The feast of the martyrs is kept on March 6th, the eve of the day of their triumph. The precious document which has preserved their history will keep their memory green, and we cannot doubt that next year, when the Eucharistic Congress is held at Carthage, the benign influence of the martyrs will hover over the city, and that their prayers will be powerful with God for the rapid re-Christianization of the land in which they shed their blood for Christ: *Sanguis Martyrum est semen Christianorum*.

T. A. JOHNSTON.

MARY WARD'S GREAT ENTERPRISE

VI

PROPAGANDA, as we have seen,¹ had begun its proceedings against the Institute in July, 1628. Yet after nearly two years' continuous endeavour on the part of its energetic Secretary, only in Naples and Flanders had he been able to accomplish the suppression effectively. Eventually, however, his efforts were crowned with success, and that success he owed in great measure to the advice and determination of the Nuncio at Cologne, Pier Luigi Caraffa, Bishop of Tricarico, and later Cardinal.

From the account, which he wrote of his legation, this Neapolitan prelate seems to have been a skilful, wise and very active diplomatist, eager to carry out to the letter the instructions received from Rome, very insistent upon the respect due to the Holy See, and also to himself as its representative, but, withal, over conscious of the success he achieved, inclined to be pompous and somewhat self-complacent. He prided himself that the suppression of the Institute by Papal Bull was due to his counsels and that his own name was mentioned in the document.²

From the available sources, it appears that the decree of Propaganda was first sent to him as late as October, 1629;³ a further letter of December 8th informing him that it concerned only the Jesuitesses of English origin. Within his nunciature there were houses of the Institute at Liège and Cologne under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Ferdinand, and at Trier under that of the Prince-bishop of that city. The task imposed on him of dissolving these houses appeared to Caraffa no easy one. In his letter of December 28th he pointed out to Ingoli that the two Prince-bishops were likely to look with dissatisfaction upon any interference in matters pertaining to their own jurisdiction.⁴ However, by the middle

¹ THE MONTH, July, 1928.

² On Caraffa, cf. Cardella, "Memorie Storiche de' Cardinali," vol. vii. p. 58 ff: Ciacconius—Oldoinus. IV., p. 674, and "Legatio Apostolica. . . . Aloysii Carafal." Edited by J. A. Grinzel, 1840.

³ In Tierney-Dodd, (IV. ccxxxii) is printed a letter of Caraffa to Archbishop Ferdinand, dated December 20, 1628. From a comparison of its contents with the papers in the Propaganda archives, it seems clear that the year should be 1629, and not 1628.

⁴ Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna, Port. etc. 1630, vol. 98, fol. 145.

of February, he held out more favourable prospects. To avoid wounding their susceptibilities he had committed the carrying out of the suppression to the Prince-bishops themselves. Both had expressed their willingness. Ferdinand, however, Archbishop of Cologne, had asked for a stay of execution, as he had been informed by the "Jesuitesses" that the Mother General was in Rome and expected to obtain for her work the indulgence and favour of the Pope. Caraffa granted the delay, but anticipating, apparently, further intervention on the Archbishop's part, strongly urged Propaganda not to rescind its decree, as such an action would lessen the prestige of the Holy See and make more difficult any future attempt at suppression.¹ The advice was unnecessary. The petition of the Foundress had already been rejected, and in his answering letter of March 26th, Ingoli conveyed papal orders to the Nuncio to effect the suppression as soon as possible.²

Events now moved rapidly. On receipt of the order to put the decree into execution, Archbishop Ferdinand sent his Vicars General of Cologne and Liège to dissolve the houses in those cities. At Liège the dissolution was effected on April 30, 1630, by reading the Edict of Suppression in the presence of the community and of the ecclesiastical officials. On the petition of the members a respite was granted of forty days.³ Reserving a summary of the Edict till later, it is sufficient here to state that though it was undoubtedly the intention of the authorities in Rome to prohibit living in community, nothing was said of that in this document, and, even as late as the following September, the Nuncio had to allow the members to live together because of their poverty and of the debts with which the house was burdened. Any sudden dispersal of the community would have made the creditors demand immediate payment and place its members in a very difficult position.⁴

In Cologne also, the suppression was taken seriously in hand, though the exact date of its completion cannot be ascertained.⁵ Here the members of the community com-

¹ Caraffa to Ingoli, February 15, 1630. Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna, Port, etc. 1630, vol. 98, fol. 149.

² Pr. Arch. Lett. volg. 1630, vol. 10, fol. 134.

³ The Edict is in Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna, Port, etc. 1630, vol. 98, fol. 163, and is printed in Tierney-Dodd, IV. ccxxiii. Cf. also Caraffa to Ludovisi, May 3, 1630, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 162.

⁴ Letter of Caraffa, September 27, 1630, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 176.

⁵ On May 3rd Caraffa reports that the Archbishop will suppress "this week." He seems to say that he has received notice of its completion, in his report of May 24. Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 162 and 164.

plained to their former patron and protector, the Archbishop Ferdinand, that they were being treated far more harshly than their companions in Austria and Bavaria and even in Rome itself, where their house was allowed to continue. Moved by these complaints, the Archbishop begged the Nuncio for some temporary mitigation in the proceedings that the Holy See might be better informed, and perhaps enjoin other measures.¹ Caraffa replied that, as he possessed merely executorial powers, he could not intervene in the way desired.² However, he dispatched the Archbishop's letter to Rome, where it was unfavourably received by Propaganda, and the Secretary replied officially by denying the facts alleged and insisting upon the decree being carried out in full.³

But before he could send off this reply, Caraffa reported in rather jubilant mood that the house at Cologne was finally dissolved and all troubles laid to rest in that quarter.⁴ Here, however, as at Liège, the poverty of the members compelled him to tolerate their living in community,⁵ and the sequel proved that his own jubilation and the warm congratulations he received from Propaganda were somewhat premature.

Meanwhile, early in May, there had come to his knowledge the important letter of April 6th which Mary Ward addressed from Rome to her associates.⁶ Though apparently intended in the first place for the community at Liège, several of its phrases give it rather the character of a circular letter, directed to all the houses of the Institute. In it she exhorted her companions to patience and constancy in the midst of persecution, for such to her appeared the movement then in progress against her work. The decree of suppression, she apprised them, was founded on false information and had for its sole author their old antagonist, Cardinal Bentivoglio. He had issued it without the authority or even the knowledge of the Pope or of any of the other Cardinals to whose decision the affairs of the Institute had been committed. She herself had only been informed of it by Mother Campion (Winifred Wigmore); for the Cardinal wished to conceal it from her till it had been carried into effect. They

¹ Ferdinand to Caraffa May 22, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 170.

² Caraffa to Ludovisi, June 7, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 172.

³ Dorsal remark of Ingoli dated July 9. *Ibid.* fol. 172v. cf. Ingoli to Caraffa, July 20, 1630.

⁴ Caraffa to Ingoli, July 5, 1630, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 173.

⁵ Caraffa's letter of September 27. *Ibid.* fol. 176.

⁶ Caraffa sent it to Rome with his letter of May 10, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 164.

should, therefore, disregard the decree and any orders issued in virtue of it, no matter by whom they were given; careful always, however, to explain with due modesty and respect the reasons for their conduct. Even if, as was unlikely, the Bishops and Nuncios should proceed to excommunicate them, let them suffer it. A remedy would soon present itself.¹

The contents of this letter have led some to question its authenticity; but the doubt is supported by no convincing argument, has the weight of evidence definitely against it, and probably owes its origin to the sinister interpretation given to the letter and the use made of it, to prejudice her good name, by the opponents of Mary Ward. These, as was to be expected, put the worst construction upon it. Caraffa at once despatched it to Ingoli as proof of her evil disposition.² The Secretary registered it as a "letter of the Mother General to the 'Jesuitesses,' exhorting them not to obey the decree of the Congregation, even though it should be imposed under pain of excommunication."³ Propaganda itself delivered it to the Inquisition as belonging by its contents to that tribunal, and urged the Nuncio to obtain the original, as the Holy Office would find it difficult to take proceedings without it.⁴ If this interpretation of the letter was accepted, there would be a strong internal argument against its authenticity, not only as being opposed to the whole tenor of Mary Ward's life and in particular to her known obedience to the Holy See, but also, as hardly consonant with the favour subsequently shown to her by Pope Urban and her complete exoneration by the Holy Office.⁵ Such an interpretation, however, as Fr. Grisar has shown, is unnecessary and is even excluded by a careful study of its contents. Indeed, it is difficult not to condemn the Nuncio, Ingoli and Mary Ward's opponents of rash and precipitate judgment due to their readiness to believe evil of her. The advice given by the Foundress was perfectly correct from her standpoint.

The proceedings against the Institute, it must be remembered, were based on the decree of Propaganda of July 7,

¹ Caraffa's letter of May 10, fol. 165.

² *Ibid.*, *ut supra*.

³ Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 165v.

⁴ Ingoli to Caraffa, June 26. Caraffa, evidently, was unable to obtain the original. Cf. Caraffa to Ludovisi, July 19, where he expresses his belief that it will be very difficult to do so. Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 175.

⁵ For Urban's favour, cf. later. As regards the Holy Office, cf. Letter of its Secretary to the Nuncio at Cologne, printed in the "Istanza," p. 21. Translation in Chambers II. p. 410.

1628. That decree, enjoining suppression, as well as its subsequent renewal and explanation, had received full papal approval. But Mary Ward did not know this. The whole underlying supposition of her letter is that Cardinal Bentivoglio alone was responsible for it, and had issued it without any knowledge or consent on the part of the Pope or other Cardinals. The decree, therefore, to her appeared spurious; a crafty trick of her antagonist to undo her work. She was right, indeed, in assigning to the Cardinal a leading part in the hostile proceedings against the Institute, but erred in thinking that they had not also the approval of the Pope. Her error, however, is intelligible. When in Austria she had heard vaguely of the threatened adverse measures, doubtless from the letters of her associates in Rome,¹ she had asked for definite information from the Nuncio Pallotto, and he had studiously concealed it from her.² Subsequently she learnt of the dissolution of the House at Naples. Yet, later, when she came to Rome in 1629, to seek confirmation for the Institute, the Pope had received her graciously and by special favour had committed her petition to a commission of four Cardinals. It was surely natural for her to conclude that the Pope, who was actually considering the question of the confirmation of the Institute,³ and who moreover was continuing to pay an annual pension to the house in Rome,⁴ could not approve nor even know of the proceedings already in progress for its suppression. True, confirmation was in the event refused; but refusal of confirmation by no means signified an order for suppression, nor even papal disapprobation of her work. Twice before had confirmation been refused, without either the one or the other following. The continued existence moreover of the house in Rome itself and the lack of proceedings against the Institute in Austria and Bavaria, even after the rejection of her petition, would but strengthen her belief that the Pope neither knew nor approved of the decree of suppression. She assigned the decree, therefore, to her old antagonist, Cardinal Bentivoglio, whom she knew definitely to be working against the Institute.

¹ The Mother Procurator etc., in Rome had some knowledge of the decree by October. Cf. Barberini to Pallotto, October 7, 1628, apud Kiewning, I. No. 118.

² Cf. *THE MONTH*, September, 1928, p. 236.

³ This fact is itself some way mysterious. Was it a reconsideration of the decree of Propaganda? Yet the measures against the Institute do not appear to have been suspended or interrupted. Our sources, unfortunately, do not aid us to solve the mystery.

⁴ The Appeal to Urban, 1629.

Her error is indeed intelligible. What rather needs explanation is the policy of her opponents in keeping her ignorant of the true nature of the decree. One would think that she should have been among the first to be informed of it. The impression indeed is left that her adversaries, fearing her influence with the Pope and some of the Cardinals in Rome, wished to carry out the suppression as quickly and as secretly as possible before she could interfere,¹ and hoped perhaps, as actually happened, that she in her ignorance of the Pope's approval of the decree, might compromise herself with the Holy See by some act of apparent disobedience. This is not a merely fanciful suggestion. The intriguing and despicable conduct of her opponents towards her after the suppression certainly appears to have had this for its object: and it was the Pope himself who eventually put a stop to it.

Granted, then, Mary's error as regards the true nature of the measures against her Institute, the problem which she, as Superior responsible for over two hundred subjects, was called upon to solve, presented itself to her as a conflict between the obligations of religious life and commands issued with apparent but no real authority. Her solution was the correct one: the obligations of their religious life remained in force: excommunication to enforce the contrary commands would not be binding in conscience.

Hostility to her, however, and to her work, led her opponents to take the worst view of the matter and, though the later action of the Pope and of the Holy Office largely negated that view, it is not to be denied that both her own imprisonment and the issuing of the Papal Bull of suppression was occasioned by the letter as her opponents interpreted it, and by the apparent disobedience of Mother Campion which seemed to accord with that interpretation.

It was in connection with the house at Trier that the intervention of Mother Campion was first witnessed. The Archbishop of the city, Philip Christopher von Sötern, despite his early promise² to see to the suppression, had been too engrossed with other affairs to give any thought to it.³ In July, 1630, Caraffa reported that he had written to him five

¹ Her influence did prevail with the Pope later in spite of determined efforts to prevent it on the part of her opponents. Hence the reconstruction of her work after the suppression.

² Caraffa to Ingoli, February 15, 1630. *Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna*, Port, etc., 1630, vol. 98, fol. 149.

³ Cf. Caraffa's letters of March 15, May 3, and July 5. *Pr. Arch. Ibid.* 157, 162, 173.

times, but had had no reply.¹ But in the end, the persistence of the Nuncio and his refusal to do any other business with him till the suppression was attended to,² prevailed, and the Archbishop commissioned his suffragan to carry out the decree. This time, however, the community proved the obstacle; for when late in August, 1630, the Bishop read the Edict of Suppression to the assembled members, they unanimously declared that the Institute could not cease unless by will of the Superior.³ This attitude was due to the intervention of Mother Campion, whom Mary Ward, apparently as soon as she had heard of the dissolution at Liège, had sent as Visitor to the different houses. From Trier, the Visitor passed to Cologne and thence to Liège, in both cities inducing the members to take up again the old manner of life.

To the Nuncio, the situation thus created became increasingly difficult. The house at Liège enjoyed both civil and ecclesiastical immunity, and any immediate and forceful step counter to these would have incensed the citizens, who were known to be very insistent on their rights and deeply attached to the community. Caraffa, therefore, first endeavoured by persuasion to turn the members from the course they were pursuing; and this having failed, except in the case of four who separated themselves from the rest and left the house, he determined to hold an official enquiry. Individually and by means of an interpreter, the members were interrogated and their opinions recorded on such questions as whether they were still bound by their vows, the continued existence of the Institute, the conduct and authority of the Visitor, and the like. Soon, even this enquiry had to be broken off, because some of the community had been in contact with a person affected with the plague. Incomplete, however, as it was, Caraffa despatched it to Rome,⁴ and some weeks later advised the authorities to imprison the Foundress and suppress her Institute by Papal Bull.⁵

From the abstract which Ingoli made of Caraffa's report

¹ Caraffa to Ingoli, July 5, *ut supra*.

² Caraffa to Ingoli, July 26, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 178.

³ Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 179, 180, 181. For a suggested explanation of their assertion cf. *infra*.

⁴ For the whole incident, cf. Caraffa's letters of September 27, Pr. Arch. *Ibid.* fol. 176, 179, 181, and Legatio Apostolica—Caraffae, pp. 57–59. The summary of the process is in Pr. Arch. Belg. s. Fland. Jesuitissae, etc. vol. 205, fol. 309ff.

⁵ Legatio—Caraffae, p. 58, and his letter of November 15, 1630. Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna, Port, etc. 1630, vol. 98, fol. 186.

it is difficult to deduce with certainty the grounds on which the members acted. More than probably they were awed and bewildered by the whole proceedings, and were not in a state to appreciate the full implication of the questions or to be meticulously careful as regards their answers. Before he came to the enquiry, the Nuncio had already passed judgment on their conduct. Months previously he had misconstrued Mary's letter. There was greater chance of misunderstanding on both sides here, in an investigation which was conducted by means of an interpreter and of which the lack of thoroughness Caraffa himself excused on the plea of his inexperience. Such considerations may possibly preclude us from placing full reliance on the enquiry. It is certainly unfortunate that we learn of Mother Campion's intervention and the subsequent events only from the account of her opponents.

Before, however, we discuss the results of the enquiry, some attempt must be made to answer the question, how far Mary Ward was responsible for these events. That Mother Campion, on being sent to visit the houses, received written instructions from the Foundress, is certain. Unfortunately these are not known to us, for the Visitor destroyed them rather than show them to the Nuncio.¹ It is just possible that the Visitor went beyond what they enjoined; there is, however, no suggestion of this in the sources, and the presumption remains that she had the authority of Mary Ward for the course she pursued. A further question is thus raised. Did the Foundress know, by the time when she sent Mother Campion on her Visitation, that the decree was issued, not by Cardinal Bentivoglio but by Propaganda and with the knowledge and approval of Urban VIII.? Here again, though absolute certainty is lacking, there seems very little room for doubt that the true nature of the decree was known to her. By April 30th, her associates at Liège knew it, for the edict read to them at the dissolution of the house on that day stated expressly that the suppression was ordered by the Pope.² To her, assuredly, they would have reported the dissolution: in fact the Nuncio, in his account of his legation, states definitely that they did so.³ It is hardly likely that in

¹ The Summary of the Enquiry, *ut supra*.

² The Edict was first read to the members in its original Latin and then explained to them in French, cf. The Edict in Tierney-Dodd, IV. ccxxxiii.

³ Legatio—Caraffae, p. 57. He also states that the Visitor was sent in consequence.

their report of it they would have omitted the fact so important to all of them, that it was the Pope who ordered the suppression. Even granted that they did so, Mary's letter of April 6th, arriving at Liège soon after the dissolution,¹ would have forced them to make good the omission. They could not have failed to notice the complete discrepancy between her statement that the decree, being the work of Cardinal Bentivoglio alone, had no papal approval, and the explicit assertion in the Edict of dissolution that the suppression was carried out by papal mandate. Her letter, it is to be noticed, had no effect at Liège;² for the members there, being better informed, realized the error of the Foundress. And the matter being so vital, they would certainly have informed her of it at once. There seems little doubt, then, that Mary Ward knew the true nature of the decree of suppression when she sent Mother Campion to visit the houses. If censure, therefore, is to be attached to the conduct of the Visitor and the community which occasioned the Nuncio's enquiry, then she also must share it.

Let it be said, at once, that our difficulty in explaining their conduct lies in the insufficiency of detail, furnished by the sources, as to what occurred, both when the suppression was effected at Liège and Cologne and when Mother Campion visited the houses in those cities. We do not know, for instance, what happened to the schools at the dissolution? Did they continue to be conducted by the members of the community as lay-teachers or were they closed? Or again, what arrangement was made to put into effect the prohibition of wearing a religious habit? Presumably, having regard to their poverty, the Nuncio could hardly have ordered them to buy new clothes. Such details as these have no slight bearing upon the explanation which we suggest below of the conduct of the Visitor and her companions.

But to return to the official enquiry. From Ingoli's summary we learn that Mother Campion had restored the old manner of life except that there was no public chapel, nor was the bell used to call the members of the community to prayer, meals, and schools.³ The exception is noteworthy, as will

¹ The Nuncio sent it to Ingoli with his letter of May 10. He had not learnt of it by May 3, or he would surely have reported it then, cf. *Pr. Arch. Ibid.* fol. 164 and 162.

² Caraffa to Ingoli, May 10, *ut supra*.

³ Unless the notes from Propaganda which I have used are incorrect, Father Grisar is in error in saying the Bells were reintroduced by Mother Campion.

appear later. Further, of the five members interrogated three, in addition to the Visitor and her companion, were of opinion that they were still bound by their vows; two of them adding that the suppression referred not to these but to exterior things, and that the Mother General had not been deposed. The Visitor and her companion also asserted that had the Pope and the Cardinals known all, they would have in no way forbidden the Institute: the congregation prohibited was something far different than that of Mary Ward. She agreed, however, that though the members were still under obedience, they should obey the Pope rather than their Mother General.

From these answers and from what has been said above, it is evident that Mother Campion knew that the suppression was backed by papal authority. If, then, acting on the instructions she had received, she disregarded the decree of suppression, she would, contrary to her expressed views, have obeyed the Foundress rather than the Pope, and her disobedience—and by implication Mary Ward's too—would have been not merely objective but formal. To say, as Fr. Grisar seems to do, that the latter would not give up the Institute until the Pope himself had definitely declared it suppressed, is no explanation on the supposition that she knew, as we think from the evidence she did know, that the decree of Propaganda was issued with papal authority. With more force, perhaps, might it be urged that both she and the Visitor, ignorant of the canonical regulations in such cases, were appealing from the Pope wrongly informed to the Pope better informed. But such an explanation seems at best very unsatisfactory and is, we think, unnecessary. The true explanation is that, in their minds, there was no such conflict of obediences. Both the Visitor and the Foundress considered that they were observing what the Pope had ordered. They misinterpreted the meaning of suppression; an error due to their source of information—the Edict which was read to the community at Liège.

A short summary of its contents will perhaps make this clear. The preamble declares that the Pope has suppressed the new Institute of the "Jesuitesses" of English origin, as never approved by the Holy See, and that Ferdinand, acting according to the instructions received from the Nuncio, suppresses by this act the "Collegium" of the Jesuitesses in his city of Liège. After this promulgation of the Edict,

therefore, they are and must be held to be secular women and not religious unless they enter a convent of a congregation approved by the Holy See. They are also declared incapable of benefiting by pious legacies. Henceforward they are not to wear a religious habit nor have their own church or chapel in which Mass is celebrated. Bells must not be used nor any ground serve as a community cemetery. Finally, under pain of excommunication, *ipso facto*, priests are forbidden to celebrate in their house.

The omissions of this Edict are noteworthy. There is no prohibition of community life, nor of the religious exercises usual to such. The superiors and officials are not declared deposed nor the obligation of subjects to obey them dissolved. Not the least mention is made of the vows.

Mary Ward interpreted it accordingly. No longer religious, nor enjoying the privileges of such, her associates, by the strict letter of the Edict, could still live in community, as the Nuncio indeed had allowed them to do; they could still be ruled by their superiors and continue their regular mode of life, with its stated hours for the various spiritual duties, meals, and recreation. And Mother Campion, we take it, in restoring "the old manner of life" did nothing but this; she revived those regular practices observed in a religious community. The chapel, we are expressly told, was not thrown open to the public: it may have been utilized as a place for prayer in common; but there is not the slightest indication that Mass was celebrated or the Blessed Sacrament reserved in it. The excommunication, *ipso facto*, would have certainly deterred priests from the former. The question of the community burial ground, for obvious reasons, did not arise. There is no evidence of the manner in which the members, before Mother Campion's visitation, had complied with the prohibition of wearing a religious habit, nor of any change being made by her in this respect. As to the use of bells, which the Edict prohibited, doubtless in the sense of outer or public bells in a tower or belfry, Mother Campion evidently interpreted this rigidly so as to include bells within the house, and we are expressly told that such a signal was no longer used to summon the members to their common duties.

That the above is the correct interpretation of Mother Campion's action is suggested by the answers of the members given above,—that the vows were still in force and that suppression referred not to these but to exterior things, as

the Mother General had not been deposed. The statement, moreover, of the Nuncio in his letter of November 15th, that the members left at Liège, though declaring themselves not to be religious, wish to continue the Institute, indicates the same. They were not religious, the Edict expressly stated that, and they obeyed it: they wished to continue the Institute—"the old manner of life," as we understand it,—for that the Edict had not prohibited. Years before, in consequence of the hope, held out by Paul V., of confirmation, Bishop Blaise had declared the members to enjoy all the privileges of a rising Religious Order.¹ Probably to Mary Ward and her companions, the Edict of suppression, with its definite explanatory clauses and its statement that the Institute was suppressed, as never having been approved by the Holy See, simply took away those privileges—chapel, bells, community cemetery, and the rest; and relegated it to the position it was in prior to the declaration of Bishop Blaise. There is indeed a suggestion in the sources that the old question was raised, on which the Bishop had formerly consulted the theologians, namely, whether the Institute could lawfully continue in that position. Suarez, as we have previously related, had answered strongly in the negative.² That, we believe, is the reason why the Nuncio Caraffa was so prompt to report that he had got into his hands the writing of Suarez in which he says the Institute cannot continue, and so insistent that Ingoli should use all diligence to see it in the house of the Jesuits at Rome, and if that proved difficult, obtain it from him.³

The comparison moreover between the Edict and the later Bull of suppression furnishes further support for this explanation. By the latter document the members were prohibited from living in community and even from meeting together for consultation on any matter whether spiritual or temporal. The General, Visitor, Rectors, and all superiors by whatever name they were called, were declared deposed and to have no authority. The vows were pronounced null and void, because the members would not have intended to take them in a state of life reprobated by the Holy See. Definite regulations, however, which we need not discuss here, were laid down in the case of those who had taken them

¹ Cf. *THE MONTH*, April, 1928, p. 317.

² Cf. *THE MONTH*, February, 1928, pp. 141—144.

³ Caraffa to Ingoli, November 22, 1630. *Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna*, Port, etc. 1630, vol. 98, fol. 187.

absolutely, without that tacit condition. In short, all the omissions so noticeable in the Edict, and which led to its misinterpretation, were made good in the Bull with unmistakable precision.¹

Moreover, to us it appears that either this explanation must be accepted or else we must admit that the Foundress, the Visitor, and the community were guilty of formal disobedience. The latter alternative, however, is in itself improbable seeing the high repute in which the "English Ladies" were held by all who came in close contact with them, such as Bishop Blaise, Archbishop Ferdinand, and the rest. Neither is this charge of open rebellion consonant with Mary Ward's letters to the Pope of November 25, 1630, and March 27, 1631,² which were written by one quite unconscious of formal disobedience; nor yet with the protection and favour granted to her by Pope Urban but a few months later, and his permission to reconstruct her almost ruined Institute.

Undoubtedly, however, the events at Liège were at once interpreted by the opponents of the Institute as open disobedience to the Holy See, and expression was given to that interpretation in the Bull of Pope Urban. Dated January 13, 1631, it was published on May 21st. Meanwhile Ingoli had delivered the Nuncio's Process to the Inquisition in the hope that it would result in a formal condemnation. Eventually the Holy Office completely exonerated the Foundress. But for the time being Ingoli scored a success; for by order of that Tribunal, but without the knowledge of the Pope, Mary Ward and Mother Campion were imprisoned on the same day; the one at Munich, the other at Liège.

Mary's companions at Munich, however, after considerable efforts, were able to inform the Pope of her imprisonment, and he at once ordered her release, leaving her free to go where she would. This apparently was not according to the mind of her opponents. By means of the Holy Office, and again without the Pope's knowledge, they first conveyed to her a message to stay at Munich, on the charitably alleged reason of her age and infirmity: then later, by the same channel, they ordered her to come to Rome, but laid down impossible conditions. Had she accepted them she would

¹ Father Guilday is mistaken in saying that the Bull is not to be found in the Bullarium Romanum. It is printed in the Luxembourg Edition, 1727. T. V., p. 215. There are several copies of the Bull in the British Museum.

² Given in Fridl, *op. cit.* Bk. II., additio Lit: Translations in Chambers II., p. 330, 367.

have come to Rome in disgrace. Her direct dealing with the Pope, however, foiled their schemes. She entered Rome a free woman and not as one released on bail. Urban VIII. received her graciously, and on hearing of Mother Campion's imprisonment at once sent an order to set her at liberty. He then permitted Mary to reassemble some of her companions in Rome, recommended them to the care of his sister-in-law, Donna Constanza, and his other relatives, and allowed her to begin to reconstruct her shattered work.¹

We may pause here, for our only purpose was to give the singular story, unparalleled in the history of religious institutes, of an admirable apostolic work, acutely demanded by the circumstances of the time, being almost brought to nought by the hide-bound conservatism—to put it at its best—of a few ecclesiastics. Despite the great difficulty of the undertaking, and the continuance of underhand opposition by her antagonists,—to which eventually the Pope himself put a stop—her Institute gradually rose again in its new form, and in the course of centuries has spread throughout the world, so that to-day it numbers members in thousands who are hoping and praying earnestly for the beatification of their much-tried Foundress, who sowed so patiently in tears that they might rejoice in the harvest.

LEO HICKS.

¹ Chambers II. pp. 381ff.

THE CREATION OF A CATHOLIC LITERATURE

IT fell to the lot of the present writer many years ago to contribute stories and articles to a weekly paper in the Far West of America. They were written in the intervals of cattle-herding, in a shack guiltless of books, among acquaintances whose knowledge of literature was, to say the least, limited. At the same time he wrote one winter, for production at the local school-house, what, by a stretch of imagination, might be termed a play. These efforts, as may be supposed, were crammed with local allusions. In fact they consisted of little more than the rough humour of that primitive community "licked into shape," but with a good deal of the roughness showing through the literary veneer. Nevertheless, in looking back over a scribbling life he has come to the deliberate opinion that, among the multifarious productions to which he must plead guilty, these hastily-written things come nearest (however far off that may be) to vital literature. As far as memory serves, however much they might have lacked of academic polish, they seem to have been alive. It was in reflecting on this fact and arguing from the personal to the general, that a suggestion occurred to him as to one of the more important factors that account for the great periods of literary creation. In examining this particular phenomenon in his writing-life the scribe in question came to the conclusion that such measure of effectiveness as he achieved was largely due to the fact that he wrote for a local public, homogeneous in character and sharing the same conditions of life. His jests, if they happened to "catch on" might pass from mouth to mouth on the same sidewalk. His phrases might be quoted in the saloons of the town in which the paper circulated. The intensive atmosphere of a society largely isolated from the rest of the world appeared to favour the putting forth of one's best.

It may seem somewhat daring to turn from such insignificant efforts to one of the greatest flowering periods in the history of the drama. Yet there is nothing really egotistic in doing so. The laws governing the mill-dam are applicable to Niagara. The secret of comparative success in the case of an obscure journalist may be held without impropriety to

explain masterpieces. There is nothing incongruous, rightly viewed, in arguing from the humble example given to the productions of Greek dramatists in the age when Greek drama reached its high-water mark. The similarity, in respect to the conditions noted, cannot be denied. No reader of the plays which delighted Athenian audiences can fail to miss the note of local interest. It was a small and (from the standpoint of our modern cosmopolitanism) an isolated community which produced these immortal works. The dramatist wrote for men whom he daily jostled in the street. His function was to elicit the tragedy or humour of myths, references to which mingled with local gossip. He could pillory types that would be recognized as standing jokes in the community's life. His plays were produced in sight of temples erected to the very deities whose actions he narrated. This intensive local interest was certainly not without its effect.

The case of the Italian Renaissance, as illustrating the same point, will occur to all. Dante wrote in a veritable hubbub of Florentine gossip. His imagination is so dominated by local affairs that the feuds of his native city enter even his vision of the Inferno, the Purgatorio and the Paradiso. Dealing with the most august and universal of themes, he yet allows local passions very largely to direct the lime-light in which his pictures of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise are seen. Dante is indeed the supreme instance of the effect on creative powers of an intense local life, and the proximity of so many contemporaries who may rightly claim the quality of genius gives additional importance to his case. Athens and Florence stand respectively for two of the greatest periods in the history of literature and art. The fact that those periods are so indissolubly linked with the names of two comparatively small cities is itself a fact of supreme significance.

To Athens and Florence we might add London. It was there that flourished those Elizabethan dramatists who gave us our most glorious literary period. The London of the sixteenth century measured by the standards of to-day was a small country town. Its playwrights could meet and discuss the problems of their craft in the same tavern, and, as we know, did do so. The cliché which our journalists use when they speak of a play being "the talk of the town" had a justification then which it lacks now. It is the fashion to sneer at coteries but it must not be forgotten that Shakespeare lived and wrote in the atmosphere of a coterie. Every

day he was able to "talk shop" with men who were allies and rivals in the same craft. The playwrights in those "spacious days" lived in a world that was anything but physically spacious. They could listen to popular criticism of their productions as they walked by the Fleet or crossed London Bridge. In "The Knight of the Burning Pestle" we have evidence that they not only listened to but took note of and replied to these criticisms. If those who have wasted their time and ingenuity in trying to prove the Baconian authorship of the plays attributed to Shakespeare had instead investigated the traces of local allusions in the plays they would have rendered a more valuable service to dramatic criticism. The echo in Hamlet's advice to the players of green-room talk and of arguments exchanged over pewter pots at the "Mermaid" is but one example of the way in which the gossip of his coterie entered into Shakespeare's work. As a factor in the appearance of that galaxy of genius which marked the Elizabethan age these conditions must be remembered.

It is a striking fact that, so far as the drama is concerned, the only precursors in England of the Elizabethan dramatists and their actors are to be found in the producers of the Mystery, Miracle and Morality plays which are so intimately bound up with specific localities. During a long period extending from Chaucer to Shakespeare there are no outstanding literary figures, no writers whose work is to be named with these two giants, none whose work was both of permanent and popular value. With the reasons for this dearth I am not here concerned but the exception named is surely of significance. These plays produced in large numbers by the guilds of such centres as Chester, Wakefield, York, Coventry, while dealing with themes of universal religious interest, did not hesitate to use local dialect or, one suspects, to introduce local and topical allusions. Beyond the fact that the choice of subjects was limited and that authorship was probably more composite in character, the conditions under which they were produced resemble closely those we have observed in the literary periods described. Here, in these popular productions created under the stimulus of local interest and with all the enthusiasm that provincial patriotism could give, we have, to a larger extent than is commonly realized the beginnings of that English drama the development of which has meant so much to the world of letters. Conventionality hampers the writers to some extent, but in

spite of this, what zest, what homely humour; what quaint originality! Characterization is crude, invention is inhibited by tradition, the dramatic sense is immature, but here undoubtedly is the block of marble which the Renaissance was to work upon with such wonderful success.

More to the purpose, so far as we are concerned, is the fact that it was at this point the Catholic drama in our country broke off. It is interesting to speculate as to what would have happened if the English Renaissance had not been accompanied by the Reformation. The continuity between the guild productions and the national drama would have been, it is certain, much clearer. It is not difficult to imagine evolving from these town-cycles a type of play very similar, having respect for the difference of time, to that for which many of us are looking to-day—dramatic creations imbued with the Catholic spirit, faithful to Catholic truth yet giving a full-blooded, richly human presentation of life. The vision of what might have been given to the world if the intellectual activity released by the Renaissance had had the inspiration of the Faith is almost too exciting to contemplate. But is that vision forever incapable of fulfilment? What if we should recommence where our Catholic ancestors left off? Suppose that, instead of trying to graft Catholic literature and Catholic drama on the trunk of our modern pagan and cosmopolitan forms, we should go back a few centuries and begin again at the point at which we left off?

The mistake, as it appears to me, in the present attempt, so far as it exists, to create a Catholic literary revival is that we do not realize the conditions necessary for the task, conditions such as those dwelt on in this article. Our writers living as isolated individuals in the midst of a Protestant population, have no vital contact either with each other or with a Catholic public. They must in each case get up their own steam, must depend on the encouragement of an invisible and scattered audience and must be without the robust zest which is imparted by a local group. To what conclusion do these considerations point? We may detect as already beginning to operate a tendency that, if developed, would be working in accordance with the theory here advanced. The presentation of Mystery and Miracle plays by groups of local Catholics is becoming more numerous. These plays for the most part are either revivals or by accredited modern authors. But there are good reasons for believing that effective work could be done by local talent. This would be shy at first. It would

stick closely to the models it had seen. But gradually it would win freedom. Technical knowledge would be speedily acquired. Capable playwrights and actors would emerge in unsuspected quarters. Once the impression was overcome that we must either slavishly imitate the past or attempt to compete with modern producers in their own line, native powers would begin to reveal themselves and the initial steps of a genuine Catholic dramatic revival would be taken. Catholic simplicity and freedom from pose and pomposity, Catholic hatred of mere sentimentality would save those concerned from the faults which have overtaken similar attempts outside the Church. Insofar as they submitted themselves to the native spirit of the Church and at the same time endeavoured to reach in a vital way living audiences, they might be assured of success. The enthusiasm generated by co-operative local effort would achieve marvels to-day as it did yesterday. But I foresee at least two objections.

The first of these would be a subconscious contempt for small-scale production which would militate against that confident enterprise so essential to any undertaking. The humble achievements possible to such groups as I have in mind would be thrown into the shade by the costly ventures of the modern theatre, and it would be difficult to realize that the small beginnings of a new order may be more worthy of attention than the finished products of the old. But this is not an insuperable objection. The humility which declares "I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness" is not altogether absent from our midst and might well apply itself to the creation of a Catholic theatre, even if, in point of staging and technical craftsmanship, that theatre should be overshadowed apparently by the institutions of those whose chief motive is financial profit.

The second objection is more serious for it deals with the alleged incapacity of the local group. Histrionic talent is supposed to be confined to professional circles and to those few who cultivate private theatricals. So also with the gifts that go to the making of the playwright. But in both these cases our calculations fail to take account either of the way in which religious enthusiasm can evoke hidden powers and of the extent to which dramatic ability exists in the average man and woman. What communities of uneducated peasants have done again and again it should be possible for English

Catholics to attempt. As a matter of fact, the necessary endowments are far more common than we have realized. Ours is a generation of spectators. We watch football and cricket matches when we might be playing football and cricket ourselves with much advantage to our health. We listen to gramophones and wireless concerts when we might be performing on the domestic piano. Even the letter-writing and diary-keeping characteristic of a former generation has fallen into disuetude since we have been able so easily to procure cheap literature and read the works of others instead of setting our own thoughts on paper. In the same way the delight in constructing dramatic dialogue and acting it which was known to the humblest craftsman of Old England has been forgotten. But it could be revived in the interests of a truly Catholic theatre.

The stress of this article has been on the possibilities from the standpoint of art of locally-organized enthusiasm. The fact has been pointed out that the great flowering periods of literature occurred in definite and restricted areas. This fact should commend itself specially to Catholics. Our religion is the religion of the Incarnation. It finds the beginnings of its world-wide mission in a small Jewish village. Moreover, it is a religion in whose worship the dramatic element is by no means lacking—a fact to which we owe the close connection between Church and stage in mediæval times. Catholics presenting the Mysteries of their Faith, or dealing with the trials and triumphs of the Christian can venture, in virtue of the fact that he is dealing with truths of universal import, to be as provincial as he likes. Catholicism, because it is Catholicism and can never lose its universality, can dare to soak itself in native colour without fear of becoming merely provincial. The fact that He Whom we worship as the Son of God was known to His contemporaries as “Jesus of Nazareth” is not without relevance in the present connection.

STANLEY B. JAMES.

CANON GOUDGE AND THE ROMAN CLAIMS

II.

CONTINUING the discussion of Canon Goudge's paper "The Roman Controversy," published in the *Church Times* (Nov. 30, Dec. 7, 1928), which I began last month¹ with a refutation of the arguments drawn by the Canon from Scripture, I have now to examine the further arguments which he describes as "the arguments from the Fathers and Church history, and certain *a priori* and *a posteriori* considerations, potent in determining our attitude to the rest."

The Historical Argument.

Canon Goudge sub-divides this argument. He writes:

The appeal to history may take two forms. In the first place, we may point to the wide acceptance, and to the wide rejection of the claims of Rome and seek to strike a balance between them. In the second place, putting detail aside, we may point to the place which the Bishop of Rome has occupied in Christian history, and ask whether, and how far, it looks like the fulfilment of a divine purpose.

With regard to this last query I may say that I shall not refer to it again, as I quite agree with Dr. Goudge in judging that "it leads nowhere." I cannot imagine why he introduced it at all, since, manifestly, the nature of the answer will depend upon the point of view of the man who gives the answer—whether he is a Catholic, or an Anglican, or some other kind of Protestant.

If, then, we confine ourselves in this appeal to history to "the wide acceptance, and to the wide rejection of the claims of Rome," I should like in the first place to point out the kind of people who respectively accepted and rejected these claims. Canon Goudge will not deny that they were rejected by all those whom he would now call heretics, without ex-

¹ See "Does Scripture disprove the Roman Claims?" *THE MONTH*, Feb. 1929, p. 140.

ception. As soon as a man fell into heresy, for example by refusing to submit to the dogmatic teaching of an Œcumenical Council, at once and inevitably he "rejected the authoritative claims of the Apostolic See of Rome," to which those decrees owed their sanction and promulgation. (That such was the relation of Rome to all General Councils cannot be proved apodeictically of Nicæa; it can be demonstrated of Ephesus and Chalcedon as of every Council subsequent to the Nicene). Undoubtedly, then, every heretic by his action, if not by his words, "rejected the claims of Rome." Surely we have here a fact of the greatest importance.

Gallicans and Anglicans may if it pleases them deny that "the claims of Rome" were accepted by all the Saints of East and West who lived before the schism of Photius; but neither any Gallican nor any Anglican has even suggested that anyone living before that time, or indeed during the first fifteen hundred years of Christianity, whom he would consider a Catholic, still remaining a Catholic, ever rejected any "claim" that was actually made by the Pope of his day—with one, or possibly two exceptions.¹

The first exception may conceivably be found in the action of St. Irenæus in remonstrating with Pope St. Victor and begging him to deal more mercifully with certain Asiatics who would not accept his ruling on the Paschal controversy. This, however, need not detain us long, since St. Irenæus in no way "rejects" or questions the Pope's authority as ultimate judge, or claims himself to settle the matter.

The second exception is more serious. It refers to the passionate resistance of Firmilian, St. Cyprian and other Africans to the decision of Pope St. Stephen with regard to the validity of heretical Baptism. This is a subject which obviously cannot be discussed at any length in this article. St. Cyprian's attitude we at once acknowledge could never be assumed by any Catholic Bishop at the present day—moreover, it was an attitude which it is very hard to reconcile with Cyprian's own language in certain of his letters regarding the See of Peter.

We will content ourselves with drawing attention to facts that will not be disputed.

¹ I am sure that neither Canon Goudge nor anyone else with any historic sense, will set much store upon the rejection of the "Roman claims" by Protestants after the time of the Reformation, excepting in so far as they may have attempted to fortify their position by reference to some supposed rejection of these claims before the time of St. Leo the Great.

1). In this dispute Pope St. Stephen admittedly was absolutely right, and St. Cyprian absolutely wrong.

2). As Tixeront¹ writes: "It is manifest that St. Cyprian does not regard the See of Rome as an ordinary See. It is Peter's See, and the Bishops of Rome are Peter's successors."

3) St. Cyprian was a convert to the Faith. Outside the Bible the only Christian writings with which he seems to have been acquainted were those of Tertullian, who had himself apostatized from union with the Holy See in consequence of his rigorism, and was exceedingly bitter in his attitude to Rome. St. Cyprian was accustomed to call Tertullian "the Master." What wonder, then, if Cyprian was more rigorous, and less Roman, than we should have wished, when a question arose on which he felt exceedingly strongly?

4) However we may feel about the conduct of Cyprian in this matter, we should never forget the remark of St. Augustine that "he expiated his fault by his glorious Martyrdom."

In any case, so far as the question of the "acceptance" or "rejection" of the Roman claims is concerned, we can afford ("without prejudice") to place St. Cyprian amongst the rejectors, and to say that before the days of Photius they were rejected by all heretics, and on one occasion by St. Cyprian and his friends. (No instructed Catholic imagines that all the prerogatives of the See of Peter were as well known in Africa in the days of St. Cyprian as they are now throughout the whole Catholic world.)

With regard to the disgraceful circumstances of their rejection by Constantinople, and the causes of that rejection, I would refer all who are interested in this subject to the writings of the late Dr. Fortescue, and even more strongly to a more recent and cogent work of the Anglican scholar, Dr. Scott, Rector of Oddington, entitled "The Eastern Churches and the Papacy" (Sheed and Ward).

So much for the "wide rejection of the Roman claims" of which Canon Goudge writes. But how about their wide acceptance? It is now generally admitted that at least after the days of St. Leo the Great, up to the time of their rejection by Constantinople, they were universally accepted throughout Christendom—to this fact the writings of the arch-schismatic Photius himself bear weighty witness,—and that at the present day they are accepted without any hesitation by the

¹ "History of Dogmas." Vol. I., p. 359.

vast and ever-increasing number of the Faithful, Bishops, priests and people, throughout the world who live in full and contented communion with the Apostolic See of Rome.

If, then, the appeal to history is to be decided by considerations of "the wide acceptance, and the wide rejection of the claims of Rome," and if we "seek," as Canon Goudge urges, "to strike a balance between them," there can be little doubt as to which side the scales will deflect, unless, indeed, we shall have weighted them beforehand. We have only to look first at this picture and then at that.

Living, as we do, at this distance of time from the earliest centuries of Christianity, in view of the very remarkable lack of Christian literature during the first three centuries, it will be always possible for men to draw different and even conflicting conclusions as they study the relations of the Holy See with the rest of Christendom. Catholics are convinced that the facts regarded as a whole are in complete harmony with their faith, whilst those who reject the claims of the Holy See tend to endeavour to fit the same facts into harmony with their denials.

To say this, is merely to say that ecclesiastical history, like Holy Scripture, needs a living authoritative teacher, before our opinions can cease to be human opinions and we believe with the certainty of Faith.

For example, in the case of the Pelagian heresy, after the dispute had been submitted to the decision of the Pope, St. Augustine wrote: "Rescripts have come from the Apostolic See, etc." (Dr. Goudge very fairly accepts the ordinary paraphrase: "Rome has spoken—The case is finished."). Inevitably, Catholics will take these words at their face value, as inevitably Anglicans will endeavour to limit their application, if not altogether to explain them away.

Similarly with regard to the Council of Chalcedon, *more Anglicano*, Canon Goudge attempts to set the Council of Chalcedon in opposition to the Pope, whilst I believe that to all impartial men it will be as manifest as the sun at noon-day that the action of Chalcedon bears the clearest evidence to the acknowledged authority of the Pope at the time as successor of Peter and Head of the Church.

I think I am fairly conversant with all that has been written on both sides with reference to this appeal to history, and I can no more understand anyone who is ready to face *all* the facts being deterred on historical grounds from accepting

the Roman claims, than I can understand anyone being precluded from accepting the authority of St. Peter by the appeal to Holy Scripture. Indeed, it is now very widely admitted by non-Catholic historical scholars, not only in Germany but also in England, that in the past the "Roman" argument drawn from history has been lamentably understated and often entirely ignored.

Other Considerations.

We now come to what Canon Goudge terms "the third division of the argument, those *a priori* and *a posteriori* arguments which do not require any detailed knowledge of Holy Scripture or of the past."

Here I may say that I fully agree with the Canon in a profound distrust of *a priori* arguments standing alone. It is, however, different when they are strengthened by undoubted facts. For example, it is useful to note that, as no founder of any great business or society can be conceived of as leaving it without a guide after his death, so there is a strong presumption that our Lord too would have provided during His life for the future government of His Church. This presumption becomes a certainty when it is strengthened by the proofs which we find in abundance in the Gospels that, as a matter of fact, He did what we should have expected Him to do.

By *a posteriori* arguments on this subject, Canon Goudge means arguments furnished from history, to prove, for example, that the Pope has erred while defining doctrine *ex cathedra*; but since he himself writes that he is not "much excited by any supposed *a posteriori* refutation of the Papal claims," I do not see why he has introduced them into the discussion, and like him, we, also, may safely leave them alone. As a matter of cold fact, it has been proved that not one of them conflicts with any Papal claim, when that claim is explained as the Pope would himself explain it—not as his opponents too often are accustomed to misrepresent it.

We have now analysed Dr. Goudge's main argument that, since "the Roman claims" are not justified by (a) Scripture,¹ (b) history, (c) *a priori* and *a posteriori* considerations, they should be rejected, together with all that their acceptance

¹ I much regret that in examining the Biblical references given by Canon Goudge, I looked for Isaiah xlv. 32, 33, instead of Isaiah xlv. 22, 23. As the chapter ends with verse 25, I suggested in the February MONTH that Canon Goudge had, by an oversight, allowed a wrong reference to be printed without correction. I apologize sincerely to Canon Goudge for my carelessness.

must involve; so that some indeterminate form of Christianity, whether Anglican, Lutheran, Calvinist, or English and American Nonconformist, has to take the place of the worldwide Church in communion with the See of Peter.

It remains shortly to consider various highly disputable propositions, unconnected with one another, which we find scattered throughout Canon Goudge's paper, all of which, under the form of *suggestion*, may easily convey the completest fallacies to the mind of his reader, masked under the guise of what affects to be incontrovertible truth.

We will begin with a misconception of certain Notes of the Church—a comment which through lack of space we were forced to hold over from our February article. The Canon is wrong on the points of Unity and Holiness.

The Creeds point out that there are four great Marks or Notes by which the Church of Christ may be identified. It is One. It is Holy. It is Catholic. It is Apostolic. Canon Goudge, in order to strengthen his argument that the Unity of the Church is not as complete as Catholics believe (in Faith, Worship and Government), that it is "rather ideal than actually realized to the full extent of the Divine purpose," writes as follows: "That *this is so with the Note of Holiness nobody doubts*; so why should it be otherwise with the Note of Unity?"¹

The words which I have italicized are exceedingly remarkable. In every age of the Church's history Catholics would not merely doubt, but would vehemently deny Dr. Goudge's statement that "the Note of Holiness has been rather ideal than actually realized to the full extent of the Divine purpose." Dr. Goudge writes that "nobody doubts this." On the contrary, all Catholics are quite sure that it is utterly false to assert anything of the sort. In this assertion Dr. Goudge ranges himself with heretics of every age, notably with Cathari, Donatists, Puritans who made the Holi-

¹ With reference to the Note of Unity, Canon Goudge insists that whereas "St. Paul enumerates seven bonds of union in Ephesians iv. 4—7, the Papacy is not amongst them." These "bonds of union" are: "One Body, one Spirit, one Hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all." It is the case that we do not find here "one ecclesiastical government" (in St. Paul's days that of "Peter and the other Apostles"; in subsequent ages that of the Pope and the other Bishops) but neither do we find "one worship in the Sacrifice of the New Law." But, as Canon Goudge, I presume, would not deny that the One Eucharist is a bond of Union although it is not "enumerated" in the Epistle to the Ephesians, why should he find it a difficulty that there is no reference here to Peter and the Apostles? After all, St. Paul did not set out to "enumerate" everything.

ness of the Church depend upon the holiness of its members rather than upon the realized purpose of God.¹ Readers of St. Augustine know how strenuously he opposed the heresy that the sanctity of the Church was compromised or even obscured by the sins of its members, and how earnestly he appealed to the teaching of our Lord that the tares should be allowed to grow up with the wheat until the harvest. I will make a short quotation from St. Optatus, the master of Augustine, to whom I have already appealed with regard to the See of Peter. Optatus sums up the Catholic teaching on the sanctity of the Church in a short sentence: "The Church then is One, and her Holiness is not measured by the pride of individuals, but is derived from the Sacraments."² The Catholic Church is, indeed, the Mother of the Saints, but she is also the home of sinners.

Holiness, therefore, is a Mark of the one true Church, no less than perfect Unity, chiefly because the true Church has been provided by Christ with the Sacraments and other means of attaining sanctity and perfection. Any religious body without the Sacraments is without one of the indispensable marks of the Church of Christ; for "individuals" in their pride to claim to be holy, or for other people to urge their holiness, real or supposed, will not prove that the body to which they belong is part of the true Church. The divine ideal of sanctity is realized, notwithstanding the sins of its members, in the sanctity of the whole body, *qua talis*, made holy by the indwelling Presence of the Spirit of God. Canon Goudge writes that "the measure in which the Church, like the individual, can receive the Spirit's Guidance, must depend upon its moral faithfulness." It would seem that he has forgotten the story of Balaam and Balak, and that of the prophesying of Caiaphas.

I will conclude this article with a reference to what is Canon Goudge's most serious offence. In order to belittle the evidence for the truth of Catholicism, he deliberately lessens the evidence for Theism and Christianity.

It has come about in this way. Canon Goudge lays hold of, and makes the most of, a well-known argument, perhaps the most difficult argument to answer satisfactorily, against the truth of the Catholic religion. "Your Faith," they say

¹ Described by St. Paul as *having been realized*: "A glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish," Eph. v. 27.

² Con. Don. I. 1.

to us, "depends, so you are always proclaiming, upon authority. This is not so. In the last analysis it depends upon the strength of the argument which led you to accept it." So Dr. Goudge: "The Roman system does not rest at bottom upon authority; it rests upon reason and private judgment, and upon reason not in the broader philosophical sense, but in the sense of logical argument." The Catholic answer is to deny this statement *in toto*. Our Faith rests ultimately not upon any argument, but on the Word of God. Catholics believe that at their new birth in Baptism a gift is bestowed upon them which enables them to discern the reality of supernatural truths, just as in their natural birth they receive or, at least, most men receive, the gift of eyesight, which enables them to discern the reality of the external world of natural objects. In both cases the trees and rivers, and the revealed truths of Faith, exist independently of our ability to recognize their reality. As Catholics grow up, if they are wise, they will fortify their faith in many ways, amongst which, in the case of educated people, the study of what are known as "the evidences" should play a considerable part. In this way their faith will be strengthened, both by supernatural means (prayer, use of the Sacraments and the like) and also by such natural means as are provided by study and the use of their intellectual faculties. But in no way does their faith depend upon their reason. It is, however, admitted that in the case of Pagans who are attracted to Christianity, and of Protestants who are attracted to Catholicism, there should be a careful examination, so far as the inquirer is in a position to make it, into what are known as the *Praeambula Fidei*, or preparatory grounds of Faith, before there can be a reasonable submission to Christ or to the Catholic Church. This inquiry, as Canon Goudge rightly observes, is first concerning the Existence of God, and secondly concerning the supreme authority of our Lord.

Canon Goudge, without any warrant from Catholic theology, declares that this inquiry is based upon reason exclusively, "in the sense of logical argument." No doubt St. Thomas' Five Great Reasons for God's Existence make their appeal to the reasoning faculty, but they are by no means exclusive of other considerations. In the case of the truth of Christianity, the case is even stronger. Our Lord does, indeed, appeal to His wonderful works, which have an over-

whelming evidential value; but, above all, He appeals to His Personality, which, for most of us, is *the* overwhelming argument which brings us to our knees, independently of all other arguments whatsoever—however striking and convincing they be. We believe *in* (ἐν) Him. In this coming to the Faith there is no going against logic, which is merely the formulation of the processes of reason that within its own sphere comes from God and must not be disregarded, but logic plays, comparatively speaking, a very small part. Christ and His Church attract of themselves, as we study them, until at last there comes to us from God the Gift of Faith.

But Canon Goudge, not content with making all our mental and spiritual processes as well as our final decision depend upon "logical argument," proceeds to assert that it is far more difficult to find God and Christ with the intellect than is really the case. He tells us that "there are thinkers of the first class who entirely repudiate our conception of God," whereas Holy Scripture, both in the Old and New Testament, teaches categorically that those who fail to find the Invisible Creator through the visible creation are "without excuse." Similarly, Canon Goudge impresses on us with reference to believing in our Lord, that "it is not easy to do this either; we have now to face the batteries of historical criticism." The subtler effect of all this is to rob those, who are influenced by it, of the certainty of their faith not only in Catholicism, but also in God and Christ. Indeed, Dr. Goudge openly teaches that no religious certainty is attainable on earth, and that it is better for us that it should be so. The world in which God has placed us, he says, "is everywhere a twilight world." Is there then no light from heaven "shining in dark places"? He also informs us that "even the knowledge which we have has been acquired slowly and laboriously and *stands ever open* to correction when fuller information is brought us. I believe that it is better so even in the highest things." How, then, is "the Gospel to be preached to the poor," and how is any man to be rooted and grounded with stability in "the Faith once delivered to the Saints," if everlastingly it is to be subject to change and revision?

At the beginning of his paper Canon Goudge wrote as follows: "It is, I hope, in no controversial spirit that I approach our subject." However high may have been his hopes, as a matter of realization, no man could have written much

less uncontroversially, or with more provocation than he has done. For example, what could be more provocative to Catholics with a knowledge of the history of their martyrs under Tudors and Stuarts and Commonwealth than to be told by Canon Goudge that: "Continuity is a rope of many strands, and when in Queen Elizabeth's reign the breach took place, some of the strands remained with the Anglicans and some with the Recusants." He can only mean that some of the strands remained in the bloodstained hands of the Elizabethan Bishops, who again and again were foremost in condemning the Catholic Recusants to death for the crime of saying Mass. For this did our blessed Fathers suffer hanging and disembowelling whilst yet alive, and other tortures unspeakable. *What* strands were still left in the hands of such Anglican Bishops as these, we wonder, and we are entitled to ask the question of Canon Goudge? At any rate, I should much like his paper and my reply to be issued together. This, I fear, is hardly feasible, so I have been most scrupulous to quote Dr. Goudge as accurately and as fully as possible, and am certain that I have in no way misrepresented him or done him less than justice. In this way I have been able to give my readers a warning which I trust may not be without effect.

O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE GREAT GAME OF SOULS.

A TRIVIAL incident of yesterday has suddenly bridged some five and thirty years of my life: as if by some mysterious working of God, my mind was peering into the "nunc aeternitatis."

Into my almost unwilling hands my Provincial, Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P., placed a slate-grey covered pamphlet with the uninviting title:

MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL UPLIFT OF THE ABORIGINAL RACES OF CHOTA NAGPUR, INDIA,—BY REV. T. VAN DER SCHUEREN, S.J.

(A paper read before the East India Association.)

The supernatural obedience that made me open the slate-grey paper covers was soon rewarded by the immediate bridging of five and thirty years of my life.

To explain. I take it as one of God's subtlest and most substantial mercies to my soul that as a young student priest I spent the three years from 1891 to 1894 at Louvain, in the heart and—I think I ought to add—the brain of Belgium. One of the thousand and one unforgettable gifts the little country made to my soul was summed up in St. Francis Xavier's cry from India to St. Ignatius at Rome, "Da mihi Belgas"—"Give me Belgians." Every day of my three short years of sojourn amongst this people authenticated the wisdom of the saint.

One day I happened to see on the conventual notice-board a black-edged invitation to a Solemn Dirge and Requiem at the Jesuit Church for one of their Fathers who had spent the best part of his years in India. During my stay at Louvain I never before or after accepted such an invitation. But that black-edged invitation moved me in some unaccountable, irresistible way. Perhaps I felt that such a work as he had ended I was beginning or attempting to begin. Perhaps the quiet matter-of-fact burial of a private from the glorious Guards' regiment, the Company of Jesus seemed a courteous invitation to the kindred courtesy of acknowledgment. Whatever my reasons,—and there may have been more motives than reasons—a young Dominican of the English Province stole almost unseen into the church where God's guardsmen were fitly saying farewell to one who had come home wounded and dying from the front.

All during the Dirge and Requiem I seemed to be talking not to God about the dead priest nor even to the dead priest about God, but to the dead priest about the young Dominican priest of the English Province who was so soon to begin his life's hunt for souls. As courteously as I could I asked the dead to forgive the imperial race for having forgotten to send her official representative with a wreath or a Union Jack. I even tried to excuse our oversight by blaming him for his skill in hiding his place of death—his own beloved Belgian place of birth. Then boldly I asked him to obtain from Jesus, whom he had followed so unflinchingly in the harvest field of India, some slender share of his love for the rich and even the sufferings of the harvest field.

That was five and thirty years ago! Since then my mind has scarcely recalled the Dirge and Requiem for a private of God's Lifeguards at the Church of the Jesuits at Louvain.

But yesterday when I turned the slate-grey covers of the pamphlet on the address delivered to the East India Association, the dead lifeguardsman of God—the mighty hunter of souls—Fr. Constantine Lievens, S.J., spoke to me from the "nunc aeternitatis."

Let me set down Fr. Van der Schueren's noble tribute to the dead missionary.

Without detracting from the merit or belittling the efforts of the earlier Belgian Jesuit missionaries who for years had done pioneer work among the Mundas . . . the real history of what now constitutes the Belgian Jesuit Mission among the aboriginal tribes of Chota Nagpur begins from November 23, 1885 when Fr. Constantine Lievens (then in his thirtieth year) settled down at Torpa . . . in an empty hut at the end of the police lines.

In a short time he had mastered the Munda, Oraon and Kharria languages and come into contact with thousands of these aboriginals.

He applied his great natural talent to the study of the laws and customs of the country . . . the laws governing the land tenures, the extent and also the limitations of the rights of Zemindars. He consulted magistrates and lawyers and soon gained knowledge not only of the obligations but also of the rights of the oppressed ryots. As a consequence in many cases justice was done.

Naturally the news spread. The result was truly extraordinary and in less than four years the number of Oraons, Mundas and Kharrias who adopted Christianity was in excess of 70,000. . . . Fr. Lievens immediately set up an organization to change these mere numbers into a compact,

living Christianity. He picked out young men from among them for special tuition and training. Very soon he had a little army of more than 200 educated Catechists and had opened more than 100 schools.

In 1892 there was a complete breakdown in the health of Fr. Lievens. He returned to Belgium . . . and died at Louvain at the age of thirty-seven.

And now let Fr. Van der Schueren utter the one touch of human sentiment in his scholarly address to the East India Association, at Caxton Hall, 15th October, 1928.

He had all the qualities of heart and mind which make a great apostle, and his name will live in history as the apostle of the aboriginal tribes of Chota Nagpur. I had lived with him in India in 1884 and 1885 and knew him intimately, and I may be permitted to pay this personal tribute to one whose life has been the inspiration of my life, as it has been of so many others who have followed in his footsteps.

No doubt the tinsel ostentatiousness of Caxton Hall heard these moving words unmoved. Yet England that dreads the mysterious Jesuit might have learned from this cry of a Jesuit to his dead brother what is really the heart of a child of Ignatius. The inspiration which moves a young Belgian when he signs on with the Company of Loyola is to labour in exile for the best years of life—and only to come home to escape not from death but from the full military honours of death where his heroism being known will be honoured. This spirit of Ignatius and Xavier must not die in the Church lest the Church itself should die.

Something like the success of the Jesuit missions in Paraguay has followed the pioneer work of Fr. Lievens. The Belgian Fathers of the Society had seen in their own country the value of the Boerenbonde, initiated by the Abbé Helleputte and the deputy Schœlært. This fine piece of constructive land organization was soon imitated amongst the aboriginals of Chota Nagpur. The reading of Fr. Van der Schueren's account of this agricultural co-operation amongst aboriginals is doubly poignant here amidst the spreading decay of England's land-workers and England's soil.

One paragraph of Fr. Van der Schueren's address unveils almost dizzy peaks of thought.

In Chota Nagpur . . . at the headquarters in Ranchi, there is a Bishop . . . a Director-General of Education and a Director-General of Social Works. Scattered in twenty-nine districts are fifty-two Belgian Jesuit priests and seventeen Indian priests and about eighty Belgian and Indian nuns. As lay-auxiliaries there are *more than a thousand instructed and*

specially trained salaried men called Catechists, while education is dispensed to boys and girls in more than 600 schools.

And now after five and thirty years let the [no longer] young priest of the English Dominican Province say, if only for discussion, some of the apostolic wisdom spoken to him from the coffin in the Church of the Jesuit Fathers, Louvain.

Hardly in one of the older—civilized!—countries of the world are Catholics numerically increasing as the normal population is increasing; yet in such places as Chota Nagpur, and with such methods as those of Fr. Constantine Lievens, S.J., the growth of Catholicism is substantial.

These methods are not new nor alien to Catholic apostolic effort. The catechist system, which John and Charles Wesley used with such phenomenal success has always been amongst the Church's first organizations for spreading and safeguarding the Faith. Chota Nagpur is an example of the value of the organization. A body of some 70 priests are helped by over 1,000 trained catechists. In other words each priest has on an average 14 catechists. It is as if each doctor had 14 trained district nurses. Between these two groups of priests and catechists there is no official jealousy, but only an official statutory relationship; as fixed, friendly and efficient as the statutory relationship between the Diocesan Bishop and the Diocesan Clergy. Imagination would fail if we sought to realize what the introduction of such a system would mean in countries which are largely losing the Faith, or in countries like our own where the prospects of conversion are still utopian. If England were organized as this Indian diocese, the overworked priests would be helped by trained Catechists! Is it fantastic to suggest that a system which has proved successful in one part of the harvest field may possibly prove successful in another?

An experienced priest who has worked some forty years on the mission 'mid an English speaking people has even suggested that the time has perhaps come for an attempt to organize on the effective Catholic lines of foreign missionary work. I heard him say, "Why should we not give the various religious groups—seculars, regulars,—definite tracts of England, as the Church gives definite tracts of foreign missions? Imagine what a success the Society of Jesus would make if it was given, say, the whole of Northumberland to organize as it thought fit. Should we not soon see a Director of Education as at Nagpur—and a Director of Social Works as at Nagpur—and land-co-operation and produce banks as at Nagpur—and 70,000 converts in four years as at Nagpur?" . . . But he asked me to say no more for the present, lest the message of Fr. Constantine Lievens, S.J., might be spoiled by the ill manner of the messenger.

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.

A HISTORY OF ECCLESIASTICAL "EIRENICS."

CHRISTENDOM is divided—and the division is very clear and very deep—into those Christians who believe that Christ's prayer for unity in His Church was heard and realized, and those who believe that it was not. In the eyes of the former the only way in which the division can be healed is by those outside the communion of the Church recognizing her divine claims and giving to her the adhesion of their minds and hearts. The aim of the latter, in loyalty to their Lord, must be to find some principle of union, apart from living authority, whereby His ideal, hitherto unrealized, may at last be fulfilled. The author of *Christian Unity: its History and Challenge* (Kegan Paul: 21s. n.), the Rev. Gaius Jackson Slosser, a Professor in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, belongs to the latter group: consequently, by those who belong to the former, the prolonged labour and research enshrined in this large volume must necessarily be regarded as, to some extent, wasted—efforts leading to no result. They cannot but feel that the City set upon the Hill is there for him to see, complete, compact, conspicuous, with definite boundaries and gates of entrance and exit: whilst what he is looking for is some city of his dreams, still to be discovered or constructed. To his mind, Christ, God Incarnate, has failed in the main thing He came on earth to accomplish, viz., to give men certain knowledge of supernatural truth, and sure access to the supernatural help called grace. His followers are split up into numberless sects, are still in doubt as to His teaching, hold extremely divergent views as to the means of salvation, do not know, for instance, whether the Mass is a piece of blasphemous idolatry or the sublimest act of worship possible. Clearly those who are sure that Christ's promise has not failed and that His Church has withstood the "gates of Hell," cannot profitably discuss the meaning of revelation with those who believe in a fallible and divided Church. They lack any common grounds of approach. We must hold, therefore, that since its underlying assumption is wholly false, this painstaking work has no very direct message for us. We should, of course, recognize the careful investigation which has gone to its formation. The author has read extensively and has marshalled a mass of historical facts with commendable skill, but his selection and interpretation of these facts is necessarily coloured by his view that Christian Unity is still to seek and by his unwillingness to recognize the only possible principle of that unity, viz., a living, infallible teaching and ruling authority. Without that, the scattered fragments of Christendom can still form a federation for social endeavour, but, as action ultimately depends on belief, even such a union will be unstable.

Accordingly, the book which, despite its anti-Catholic bias, is honest in purpose, becomes rather a chronicle of failure than of success: and this, indeed, since success is impossible except under conditions against which the sects have set their minds and hearts, is only to be expected. However, the Catholic student may indirectly learn a good deal from it: it is always a salutary thing to see ourselves as others see us, even though their views are mistaken. It shows us the need of constant exposition of the truth.

Mr. Slosser, no doubt, has tried to understand Catholic theology and the Catholic ethos generally, but his wrong views about Probabilism (p. 33), for instance, a difficult question for the untrained mind, indicates a general inability to judge Catholic doctrine in its proper setting. He confounds Probabilism with Laxism, some immoral propositions belonging to which system, to the number of 65, may be found in Denzinger (1928), pp. 360 sqq. He is, seemingly, not aware that Probabilism did not begin with the Jesuits, but was in vogue before their foundation, nor that, after centuries of discussion have served to bring out its common-sense character and to clear it of ambiguities, it is now almost universally accepted in the Church. Again, in his desire to discredit the Jesuits, he copies from Döllinger various heads of accusation against them as matters of common belief—"The Jesuits are generally made responsible for the persecution and death of Cyril Lucar, for the vicious attitude of the Roman Catholics in the Thirty Years War, for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, for the Inquisition,¹ and for the slaughter of the French Huguenots" (p. 33). One gauges the cultural level of controversialists by their attitude towards the shibboleths of bigotry, used by the uneducated. Mr. Slosser would suffer from such a test, for he is amongst those who have "Jesuits on the brain." "It cannot be denied," he writes with calm assurance, "that the whole matter of the Roman Church's attitude towards union, or aloofness with regard to other Churches has, in recent centuries, been almost wholly determined by the Jesuit Order" (p. 106). We shall perhaps startle the writer by saying that the allegation can be, and is, denied. The attitude of the Catholic Church towards union was determined by her Founder, who ruled that those disobedient to Church authority should be excommunicated. Accordingly, St. Paul and the other Apostles laboured to maintain the unity of Church discipline, and the integrity of Church doctrine by ruthlessly cutting off the recalcitrant. The early Councils of the Church manifest the same spirit: from its very origin the Roman and Catholic Church has never recognized the canonical existence of "other Churches."

¹ An uneasy sense that the dates do not fit causes Mr. Slosser to add cautiously in a footnote to the word "Inquisition,"—"The Dominicans shared in this"!

Mr. Slosser, whose very creed is an express denial of that doctrine, whose book has been written on the assumption that it is not true, naturally does not agree with St. Paul, but he should not ascribe to one small lately-organized group of Catholics within the Church what has been one of her essential characteristics from the beginning. True to the nebulous Church theory common to the sects, he regards the development of doctrine by means of definitions of faith and rejections of heresy, as a *narrowing* of the Church, invoking in support that eminent anti-Papalist, the Anglican Bishop of Gloucester, author of the statement that at the Council of Trent the Roman Catholic Church ceased to be Catholic and began to be "a sectarian society." Mr. Slosser, indeed, would go further back than Trent. He says that the introduction of the *Filioque* clause into the Creed by the Council of Toledo, 653 (not 589, as Mr. Slosser wrongly states), was "another factor which has contributed to making the Roman Church simply another one of the Western Sects." These Foxes who have lost their tails are unanimous in pretending that their loss is really a gain, and so, in spite of the phenomenon of the Catholic Church spread all over the globe and embracing under one rule of faith every diversity of race, we have these pettish references to her as a "Western Sect."

We cannot, then, acquit Mr. Slosser of blind and ignorant prejudice which underlies his whole treatment of the subject, especially as it breaks out now and again into virulent abuse. For instance, after repeating Dr. Headlam's petulant assertion that the Roman Church "began to become a separate sect at the Council of Trent," he states, as "a certain fact," that after the Vatican definition it "lost all claim to Catholicity . . . cut itself loose from the helps and graces which come from deference to thought, life and powers without its own life and is now on its career of sublime self-sufficiency and consummate egotism, coupled with iniquitous haughtiness and suicidal pride" (202).

It is not in this spirit that true history is written. Given the assumptions of Catholicity—that Christ, in founding His Church, endowed her with the gifts of unity, inerrancy and indefectibility—the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is the only possible attitude, her conduct is the inevitable result of those assumptions. Those may be questioned, examined, refuted, if possible, by people who disbelieve in them, but to attack conduct based on firm belief in them is both illogical and unfair. Mr. Slosser agrees in somewhat confused language that Papal infallibility "is the logical outcome of the policy of a sacerdotal Church that is infallible and that is based on Peter and his successors" (p. 202). Why, then, abuse those who are only acting in accordance with their conscientious beliefs? Earlier in his work (p. 32) he endorses the sentiment that "the best way to promote peace

is to refrain from saying mean things about one another": but he not unfrequently falls short of his own standard.

It would appear, as the upshot of his survey, that the utmost Mr. Slosser hopes for from the movement towards Christian Unity is some sort of Church Federation. He realizes that, apart from the necessarily uncompromising claims of the Catholic Church, there is an unbridgeable gulf between other Christians in their views of the sacerdotal order and the Apostolic succession:—a gulf which can only disappear by one side adopting the views of the other. He does not realize that the unity of belief and government and worship, which Christ provided for His Church, could be made real and permanent only by the Holy Spirit guiding each individual to the truth, or by the same Spirit abiding with some perpetual, visible, infallible authority so as to secure unity and continuity of belief, and a sure standard of conduct. Accordingly, his elaborately-compiled study is a standing monument to the failure of any other principle of unity than that which secures the wonderful supernatural harmony and completeness of faith amongst Catholics. From this point of view, despite its many defects, the volume has a distinct value, as a further proof of the bankruptcy of the "Reformation."

J.K.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The Emancipation of the Pope.

Since the ending of the Great War no event has occurred of greater moment than the ending of the estrangement between the Holy See and the Italian Government, an estrangement which has embittered their relations for nearly sixty years. The situation had seemed so inveterate, the differences so irreconcilable, that the solution, long debated yet kept wonderfully secret, has come like a shock upon a world which had almost given up hope of seeing it. That world, speaking generally, is pleased, for the settlement is a gain to peace. But presently the enemies of the Papacy will become vocal, for any increase of the Pope's power and prestige is hateful to them. Those who want to abolish Christianity recognize in the Church the chief obstacle to their plans, and the Church stands to gain immeasurably by the acknowledged sovereign independence of her Head. Those who regard Catholicism as a perversion of the Christian faith cannot but regret the accession of strength and influence which the liberty of the Pope will bring to it. These voices will not long be silent. But in Italy, where Signor Mussolini has effectually suppressed the Free-

masons and other anti-clerical bodies, there will not be even verbal protest, although the dramatic reversal of the policy which usurped the Papal sovereignty in 1860 and 1870 must be gall and wormwood to those who wish to push it still further. Outside Italy, we must be prepared for much ignorant and hostile comment on the situation from those to whom Giant Pope is still a bogey,¹ as well as from the anti-Christians of our time. Portadown will not be pleased, nor will the Ku-Klux-Klan.

**Temporal Power
a basis and sign of
Independence.**

Meanwhile, there is only one feeling in the Catholic world, that of intense gratitude to Divine Providence for so ordering events as to make this consummation of its constant longings possible and actual. A generation ago it could not have been imagined, still less in the decades immediately following the sacrilegious spoliation of 1870, when indignation against that act of barefaced brigandage was at its height. Nothing could have satisfied Catholics then but the complete restoration of those domains of which the Holy Father had been deprived so unjustly. The evil means and the evil instruments employed had vitiated whatever there might have been good and desirable in the cause of the unification of Italy. Compromise with, recognition of, the actual robbers was unthinkable, and so the Popes were morally forced, as a protest against the usurpation, to remain prisoners in the Vatican, hoping for better times. Those times have come at last, hastened by the return of the Italian Government, under Signor Mussolini, to the public profession and practice of Catholicism. On his part the Supreme Pontiff, as only he could, has waived, in the interests of peace, his claim to the States of the Church and thus made *de jure*, Italy's *de facto* possession of them. Ever since the spoliation, the Popes have made plain that what they protested against was not the robbery of their territory as such, but the consequent loss of complete independence. They never became subjects of United Italy: they remained sovereigns, but without those outward and visible signs of sovereignty that compel the recognition of the world, chief of which is an independent and inviolable territory. That once secured, its extent, though not its position—for the seat of the Church's government must be in Rome—is, as the Holy Father himself has indicated, immaterial. Only as a means to the end—independence—is Temporal Power thought necessary by the Papacy. Side by side with the overwhelming spiritual dignity of the Vicar of Christ, Catholics look upon earthly sovereignty as a poor and paltry thing. By taking,

¹ One such has already suggested (*Daily Telegraph*, Feb. 14th) that non-Vatican Catholics owe civil as well as spiritual allegiance to the Pope, and therefore cannot be loyal to their own countries. Such arguments only show how religious rancour can obscure common sense.

it would seem, less than he might have reasonably claimed, the Pope has shown, not only a desire to make things easy for the Italian Government, but also, and dramatically, that his Kingdom does not enter into comparison or competition with those of the world, however it resembles them in the two essentials of independence and integrity.

**Journalistic
Conjectures.**

There are a multitude of developments arising out of the new situation which only time can enable one to realize. But that does not prevent the hasty journalist from crude conjectures of various sorts. It would almost seem as if the Press imagined that the first use to which His Holiness would put his new-found freedom would be to resume his explorations of the Alps or make a tour of the Catholic world. Even before 1870, the royal Popes rarely left Italy, unless compelled by some form of persecution; it does not seem likely that there will be a breach in that tradition; unless, indeed, the whole world becomes Catholic; in which event the Pope can visit his children everywhere as a Father instead of encountering on all sides polite but mistrustful groups of unbelievers. Other journalists have wondered whether the new Vatican State will claim membership in the League of Nations, and one busybody in the House of Commons begged the Foreign Secretary to oppose such a claim, on the wholly imaginary plea that the United States might on that account be more reluctant to join the League. As a sovereign Civil State, the City of the Vatican has as much right as any other, and more right than several, to be represented in any assembly of the nations but, mindful of his universal spiritual Princedom, the Holy Father has had inserted in the Concordat a clause declaring "that the Vatican wishes to remain, and will remain extraneous to the temporal competitions [we have not the Italian text] between other States as well as to international congresses convened for this purpose, unless the parties in conflict appeal unanimously to its mission of peace." This phrase, although not alluding directly to the League of Nations, which is far more than "an international congress," seems to indicate plainly enough that the Holy See does not desire any active and direct share in the work of the League, although it may in time become a more potent influence in the cause of peace than the League itself.

**The
new Papal State
and Italy.**

The Law of Guarantees of 1871 against which the Popes consistently protested, recognized, indeed, the sovereignty of the Roman Pontiff but deprived him at the same time of the necessary territorial support for it, even the Palace of the Vatican being only granted to him—insult, surely, added to injury—"for his own

use and enjoyment." As the Papal sovereignty is not the creation of the civil power but is inherent in the papal office, its territorial expression has never depended and does not now depend upon any revocable grant from outside. The bilateral Treaty has removed the last ambiguity in this matter. Morally, the Papacy and the Italian State have come closer together: politically, there is a clear-cut gulf between them. The Concordat, which recognizes the law of the Church in "mixed" questions such as education and marriage, does no more than pre-Reformation England did or than Spain does to-day. To forms of Government, provided they be in accord with justice, the Church is necessarily indifferent. She refuses to be identified with the Royalists in France; she is not to be deemed Fascist in Italy. Indeed there are certain features of that polity against which Pope and Church have already protested more than once as contrary to Catholic teaching. That protest is now likely to be more effective.

The conjectures that this or that Continental power may be alarmed, because Italy has now returned to that filial relationship towards the Church which befits a Catholic State, Catholics may regard with indifference. It is natural and right that since Rome is the Providential seat of the Papacy, the country wherein Rome is situated should be in close connection with the Holy See. If God had allowed Napoleon to succeed in making Paris the centre of Christendom, France would then have found herself in the position which she is said to grudge to Italy to-day. However, the impartiality of the Holy See does not depend, as some non-Catholics absurdly suppose, on the maintenance of the deplorable cleavage of 1870 and it is even possible that the new relations will remedy what has been characterized as the "excessive Italianization" of the Church; it is said, for instance, that a redistribution of dioceses, in harmony with the less numerous political divisions of the country is in contemplation.

Varieties
of
Catholicism?

The endeavour of the Editor of the *Review of Reviews*,¹ Mr. Wickham Steed, who is the English exponent of Continental "liberalism" or anti-clericalism, to distinguish between "Roman" Roman Catholicism and the kind supposed to flourish elsewhere, is unworthy of the political acumen of that distinguished publicist. We have had occasion more than once to question the accuracy of his pretended "inner knowledge" of things Catholic, and when he tells us that "obedience" is the "abiding rule" of the Italian variety and that we non-Italians are in this matter "uncomprehending 'converts,'" our estimate of his wisdom suffers another shock. After all, Italian Catholics do not need Mr. Steed to tell them that the principle of authority—"absolute

¹ February issue, p. 100.

obedience in matters of faith and morals"—is the main bond of cohesion in their Church. They are not behind their "Roman" brethren in their recognition of the Church's right to teach, to rule and to maintain discipline. In fact the old witticism—"Laws are made in Rome and obeyed elsewhere"—would suggest an impression that foreign Catholics are even more submissive than the "Romans" to divine authority. We admire much of Mr. Steed's political work: since the war, for instance, he has done yeoman's service to the cause of peace; but in dealing with Catholic ecclesiastical politics he depends too much on "the thing that isn't so." In such matters we can check him, for like many others he has Jesuits on the brain. Without any warrant he describes the Society as "formerly hostile to all attempts to solve 'the Roman Question.'" How in the world does the good man know? And if he doesn't know, as in the circumstances he cannot, why in the world does he say it?

**The
Pope on his own
Policy.**

If the impatient journalists we have mentioned had waited for a day or two they would have found an answer to most of their doubts and difficulties from the lips of him best equipped to solve them, *i.e.*, from the Holy Father himself. In his address to the Parish Priests of Rome and the Lenten Preachers, delivered on February 11th and published in the *Osservatore Romano* on February 13th, and in his speech on February 14th to the students of Milan University, may be found a clearly-phrased, exhaustive, authentic and convincing explanation of the Pope's policy and motives in regard to the Settlement. In view of the uninformed comments with which we are sure to be deluged during the next few weeks, it is to be hoped that all Catholics will make themselves familiar with the contents of these important discourses, which have already been summarized in our papers. After mentioning the more spiritual topics which he wished to be emphasized in the Lenten Sermons, the Pope went on to refer separately to the Treaty, the Concordat and the Financial Convention, which at that moment were being signed at the Lateran. "The Treaty," he said, "is intended to recognize and (*quantum hominibus licet*) to secure to the Holy See a true, proper and real territorial sovereignty (there not being known to the world, at least up to the present, any form of sovereignty that is true and proper, other than territorial), which is clearly both necessary, and also due to him who, in view of the divine command and the divine Person whom he represents, cannot be the subject of any earthly sovereignty."

As for the Concordat, which the Pope insisted should be indivisibly joined to the Treaty, its sole object was "to regulate the status of religion in Italy where it has so long been ill-treated,

subverted and ravaged by a series of governments either sectarian or, even when not hostile, yet swayed by the enemies of the Church."

**Providence
his main
Guarantee.**

The Pope, in taking the entire responsibility for the Settlement, does not hope to please everybody, "a thing in which ordinarily even the good God Himself does not succeed," and so he has made his own the word of the prophet concerning Christ Himself—"Ego autem in flagella paratus sum." He explained that Cardinal Gasparri's announcement to the Diplomatic Corps was merely an act of ordinary courtesy and not in any sense intended to ask their consent or approval or support, for "there could be no other arbiter of the affairs of the Holy See and the Church than the Pontiff." He did not want an international guarantee: the Powers looked on inactive when his predecessor was despoiled: he trusted his Italian children but most of all relied on Divine Providence.

Finally the indemnity was but a small fraction of what was due in law and justice, for not only the Papal States but the Church in Italy had been unjustly deprived of many possessions. He asked only enough to maintain the dignity and to carry on the administrative work, of the Holy See. As for the needs of the Church at large, wide as the world itself, the charity of the Faithful will never fail to make the Pope its almoner.

In his address to the Milan Student deputation, the Pope spoke in a lighter vein but even more frankly. No more authentic commentary on the great Settlement than is contained in these two speeches could be desired and in view of the future publication of the full terms, it is important that the Holy Father's own explanations will always be kept in mind.

**Armaments
still
growing.**

Well might Mr. Baldwin say, last October, of the Kellogg Pact: "The conception is so vast that I doubt if people have yet realized the full import of it." Every day since that date has illustrated the truth of that remark. The conception is so vast that, so far from realizing it, many people cannot find room for it in their hearts or in their heads. They go on thinking and speaking and desiring, as if it did not exist or as if it meant nothing. Rightly understood, sincerely intended, the Kellogg Pact should mean the closing of the War Offices of the World. If private war is to be no more, private preparation for war should likewise vanish, and the Kellogg signatories should be meeting together only to decide what contingent each should furnish towards the policing of the world. But neither those who pushed the Pact through the American Senate, nor those who followed it up by a

Navy Bill of vast dimensions, showed that they understood it so. Senator Borah got the Pact passed by convincing his fellows that their right to fight when and whom and where they wished remained unimpaired by it and the "Big Navy" men rightly argued that in such case they must be getting ready. Of course, things were not put so crudely as that, but if any other meaning can be read into, or out of, the results, we should be glad to hear it. The stark truth is that, during the last four years, in spite of the League, of Locarno, of the Kellogg Pact, each of the six Great Powers—Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the States—shows a steady and substantial increase in armaments expenditure, *even when costs are reduced to pre-war price levels*. Great Britain's outlay has grown by thirteen million pounds, that of France by one and a half million, that of Germany by ten million, that of Japan and of the United States by about four million each. Italy, the figures for which are calculated on a varying basis has, at any rate, spent eight million more last year than the year before. These are facts which speak much more eloquently than verbal professions, and they cannot but inspire the common citizen, whose deepest desire is stable peace and who on the lowest ground can imagine better uses for his hard-won money than this unproductive and destructive expenditure, with profound misgiving. What hidden germ is it that keeps the nations in a state of fever and makes them seemingly incapable, however much they desire it, of reducing their war-waste? A reasoned discussion in our last issue¹ ascribes the phenomenon to the unconscious working of an ill-regulated and avaricious capitalism, seeking personal and immediate advantage to the oblivion of the general good. If that is the case the cause of peace will demand more radical methods for success than the lip-service of unimplemented Pacts.

**The Meaning of
the
U.S. Navy Bill.**

It is not our purpose nor within our province to criticize the action of the American Senate in off-setting the Kellogg Pact by the Navy Bill, but it is desirable, for the sake of international confidence, that the apparent contradiction between the two actions should be shown to be on the surface merely, or recognized as indicating the existence of two opposed "schools of thought" in the States on the subject of Peace. Individual political development varies so enormously and the lessons of the war have been so unequally assimilated that there are possibly some who still think that peace is better secured by increasing than by diminishing armaments. In any case, if American capital sees more profit in making swords than in making plough-shares, who shall say it nay, save the American people? Of all the nations

¹ "Why the Nations cannot disarm," *THE MONTH*, Feb., pp. 97—107.

in the world they can best bear the burden of an immense naval force, but they will not be induced to bear it without being persuaded of its advantage. It is the conflicting views of sea-law that cause the anomaly. As long as Great Britain maintains her claim to supervise in war-time all neutral commerce with her adversary, the States will see to it that they have strength enough to dispute that claim. Any interference with their claim as a neutral to trade with belligerents will be regarded as an act of aggression. That, it is now generally understood, is one main reason why the countrymen of Mr. Kellogg give heed to their "Big Navy" party. But here, there seems to be some want of clear thinking. The Kellogg Pact, faithfully adhered to, is expressly designed to prevent that situation, *i.e.*, "private war," ever arising. If war breaks out again, then, whether because of membership of the League or signature of the Pact, *there will be no neutral nations*. In any violation of the peace of the world, the whole world has come to be interested. The preservation of international peace has now become the duty as well as the policy of all. Accordingly, there is no point in maintaining an interpretation of sea-law which circumstances have rendered obsolete, and which, in any case, in view of America's counter-interpretation, could no longer be upheld. Let Great Britain only recognize that fact publicly and officially, and the groundlessness of the so-called "need" for colossal naval armaments will become manifest. In the new naval negotiations between the Great Powers, which the British Ambassador to the States foreshadowed on February 15th, we hope that all parties will endeavour to grasp the full implications of the agreements they have already entered on.

Meanwhile, some of the European States, under the inspiration of Soviet Russia, have determined to act in respect to each other as if the Kellogg Pact already implemented by Russia and others.

Pact they have ratified is meant to be acted upon. On February 9th, five nations signed the Litvinoff Protocol for bringing the Pact into immediate operation, *viz.*, Russia, Poland, Rumania, Latvia, and Estonia. What the Protocol adds to the Pact has not been made clear, but perhaps the resolution proposed by U.S. Senator Capper by way of making the Pact effective, gives some indication of what those States intend. Mr. Capper realizes that it is the influence of armament-firms, which would run the risk of ruin were war effectively proscribed, that accounts for many politicians giving merely lip-service to peace, and he therefore proposes that America should pledge itself, and ask the other Pact-signatories to do the same, not to permit the shipment of arms to any State which violates it. The proposal is a logical development of the Pact, and would, indeed, as it is claimed, "put teeth" into that instrument; more will probably be heard of

it when the question of ratification comes before the British Parliament. Meanwhile it shows one direction—the strict regulation of armament traffic—in which the Litvinoff Protocol may operate. It may be remembered that the Russian proposal of entire universal and immediate material abolition of military (as distinct from police) forces is still before the League of Nations.

**Capital
and
Labour.**

The approaching General Election seems likely to turn mainly on the scandal of unemployment. The present Government, backed by a powerful majority in both Houses has proved unable to remove that scandal. It can point with some justice to the General Strike and the Coal Strike as some explanation of its impotence: under the like handicap the other parties also would probably have failed. It is generally recognized that the strike-weapon, the possibility of using which distinguishes the freeman from the serf, was then employed unwisely, and, accordingly, prominent representatives of Labour and Capital, under Lord Melchett and Mr. Turner, have laboured for over a year in the better way of co-operation. An Interim Report from this Conference on Industrial Reorganizations was accepted, as material for further discussion, last September by the Trade Union Congress, but alas! rejected on February 13th by the National Confederation of Employers' Organizations and the Federation of British Industries. These representatives of Capital, it is true, invite in their turn the General Council of the Trades Unions to form with them a Joint Industrial Council, but thus they practically ignore all that has been hitherto done, and postpone that mutual recognition of the rights of both parties which is essential to industrial peace. This unfortunate attitude on the eve of an election which may possibly put Labour in power, is deplored by such "capitalist" papers as *The Times* and *The Saturday Review*, and certainly it seems to ignore the fact that the only chance of staving off a revolutionary attempt to establish Socialism is for Capital to compound with its adversary, Labour, by establishing and stressing the identity of their main interests. What persuasive elements Socialism lacks in the eyes of the strongly individualistic British worker may easily be supplied by a sense of genuine grievances callously ignored.

**The
Worship of the
Fog.**

We wrote some words a few months ago about the "Worship of the Fog" that obtains in Anglican circles, meaning the curious reluctance shown by their writers and spokesmen, to face logical issues and to explore the real meaning of the various shibboleths constantly on their lips. We should not have been surprised to find these strictures resented, for it is a detail of the worship aforesaid to insist that the fog is in reality sweetness and

light. However, so far from taking that line a well-known Anglican, the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, Editor of *Theology*, has actually and emphatically endorsed our view. In a letter to the *Church Times* (Feb. 3rd) he writes: "The great and blinding weakness of English Christianity at present is its *complacent vagueness*. No truth, no moral law, no rule of life or prayer, is considered binding." The words we have italicized express our contention: they are all in the fog and content to remain there. Take, for instance, the question of inter-communion with nonconformists. The Bishop of Liverpool not only advocates but allows it. The *Church Times* (Feb. 8th) begs him to say whether he is prepared to give up Episcopacy, and goes on to declare with astonishing assurance: "The English Church has never failed to claim that its bishops and priests derive mystical power and authority in direct succession from the Apostles." But the new Archbishop of York will have nothing to do with such a claim. "Our habit in England," he said at Middlesbrough on January 28th, "has always been to take the practical situation, deal with it in the best way we can, and find out afterwards what were the principles involved. Then we set them down for the guidance of our successors." His Grace does not see that, if this has *always* been the Anglican practice, some principles must already have been established during the 350 years of his Church's existence. However that may be, the conferring of special grace for special spiritual functions by the administration of the rite of orders has not yet become one of those Anglican guiding principles. Witness the Archbishop of York himself. Before his elevation to the Archdiocese, he told the Manchester Diocesan Conference (Nov. 2, 1927) that:—

On the question of the celebration of Holy Communion, *because we claim no special virtue for our historic order*, we should welcome the communicants from any recognized Christian bodies. . . . We must come to the conclusion that, not only a Free Church minister but *any layman* who, devoutly and not defiantly, decides that it is right for him to celebrate the Holy Communion *can effect a real consecration*, and that through that consecration the real gift will be given.

Where is there, in these words we have italicized, the claim which the *Church Times* so confidently advances? Or in the words of the Bishop of Durham, when Bishop of Hereford, to his ordination candidates in 1908, viz., "The Kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system. . . . This absence of any Sacerdotal Order from the Christian Church, rightly understood, is deserving of all the more attention because of a tendency in a section of our Church of England to drift back towards the erroneous and misleading

Roman doctrine of a sacrificing priesthood." The views of Dr. Barnes, of Birmingham, who with characteristic disdain described (Feb. 11th) Roman Catholicism as a "semi-pagan variant of Christianity," are too notorious to need more than mention. So the "historic claims," appealed to by the *Church Times*, appear, to others dwellers in the fog, either not to exist or to be a backward drift of a section towards Roman superstition. The *Church Times* is directed, very ably let us grant, by a layman, yet, for all his claims of "mystical power and authority" for his Bishops, he denies and derides their teaching whenever he thinks fit.

**The Anglo-
Modernist Bible
Commentary.**

The modernism which is rampant in Dr. Gore's Commentary on the Bible has provoked a few protests from believing Anglicans. Lord Halifax, as we should expect, will have none of it: he goes for the interpretation of Scripture to the "Church," not to any chance gathering of higher critics. The English Church Union, which financed the book makes a lame attempt to evade responsibility: it does not uphold everything: it has no authority to exercise censorship: it merely approved the general scheme of the Commentary and is not accountable for details. It is as if one were invited to a banquet and told by the host, "some of these dishes are tainted, others poisonous, but there is, after all, a fair amount of sound food for your selection; so set to." That is all, indeed, the E.C.U. can say. The fog is as thick here as elsewhere in the system. The historicity of the Old Testament, including the account of the Fall of Man, is practically given up: the Book is to be regarded as an interesting collection of folk-lore and tribal legend. That is the basis, in fact, on which it is recommended for use in schools by a writer in *The Times Educational Supplement* (Feb. 16th) who would have the shifting results of the higher criticism put before the young, as matter on which to whet their intellectual teeth! The discussion on the Commentary in the *Church Times* has incidentally exhibited one of the puerilities into which "higher critics" have fallen. Dr. Goudge, the critic in question, disputes the historicity of the visit of the Magi, mainly on account of the "star." "What the story says is plain," he writes (*Church Times*, Feb. 8th), "One of the stars descended so close to the earth that it could point out the road to Bethlehem and the right house to which to go." Accordingly, so simple and ignorant a writer cannot be trusted as regards the other details! But St. Matthew does not say that "one of the stars descended," etc. He is silent as to the nature of the "star," which the Magi for their part distinguish from the stars of the firmament by calling it "His." Thus the critic first *assumes* that St. Matthew means one of the fixed stars and then proceeds to draw his arbitrary conclusions. There is much good in the serious and scholarly

criticism of the Bible, text and environment, but comment such as this tends to discredit the whole process.

In Defence
of
Mgr. Batiffol.

It is natural that those who thought—quite without grounds—that the late Mgr. Batiffol was so sympathetic towards their position as to be ready to modify the traditional Catholic doctrine regarding the relations between the Papacy and the Episcopate, should try to read into his writings a sense which supports their view. This the *Church Times* did in its eulogistic "leader" on Batiffol (Jan. 18th), and when Fr. Woodlock (Jan. 25th) protested at this "imputation of heretical views" to a perfectly orthodox theologian, the editor gave as his authority a statement of Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble, Oxford, in the *Protestant Review, Theology*, for Oct., 1926. Therein Dr. Kidd, reviewing Batiffol's *Catholicisme et Papauté* (1925) claimed that the distinguished author had made "some generous advances" in the matter (*Theology*, p. 228). We may note in passing this characteristically Anglican way of regarding controverted truth. Settlement forsooth, is a matter of compromise, attained by sacrifice on both sides: here, Mgr. Batiffol is supposed to reject some portion of Catholic doctrine to make the rest easier of acceptance—a sufficiently grotesque notion when one is dealing with the "deposit of faith." However, the "generous advances," when the French is more accurately translated, turn out to be non-existent. "Il est, en effet [writes Mgr. Batiffol, p. 25] de théologie élémentaire que, l'inerrance de l'Eglise étant posée en principe préalable, le sujet de cette infailibilité n'est pas le pape seul, mais est constitué aussi bien, soit par les évêques dispersés à travers le monde, soit par les évêques réunis en concile œcuménique." This Dr. Kidd understands to mean that "the subject of infallibility is not the Pope alone but the episcopate in union with him." The wish fathering the thought, he omits to notice that so far from making any "generous advance" Mgr. Batiffol mentions this doctrine as "de théologie élémentaire"—the common teaching of the text books—and that the phrase "aussi bien," which Dr. Kidd overlooks, indicates that the subject of infallibility is *alternatively* the Pope alone or the Pope in consultation with the Bishops. So Dr. Kidd's summary should run—"the subject of infallibility is not [only] the Pope alone but [just as truly] the episcopate in union with him"—which is in truth elementary doctrine.

But Dr. Kidd pushes his misunderstanding further. Having suggested in a previous issue **A Further Misunderstanding**, of *Theology* (Nov. 1924) that "the episcopate and the Pope are related to each other as a college to its head—neither can move without the other," he

claims in his later review that "Mgr. Batiffol does me the honour of accepting" the comparison, and cites p. 12 of "Catholicisme et Papauté" in proof. But there is nothing on that page, or elsewhere, to support his claim. After owning that the papal pre-eminence has sometimes been so insisted on as to overshadow the rôle of the Episcopate, Batiffol goes on "l'episcopat appartient à la constitution divine de l'Eglise et y garde son rôle coordonné à celui de la papauté,"—once more a statement of common Catholic doctrine into which quite unwarrantably Dr. Kidd reads his own mistaken analogy of a college and its President, each unable to move without the other. Can we wonder at the failure of the Malines conversations when we find one of the chief Anglican assessors thus allowing his prepossession to lead him to misread such simple French? In a later issue the *Church Times* (Feb. 1st) tried to justify the Warden by saying that Mgr. Batiffol had not rejected, and therefore had presumably accepted, the illustration [of the College and its Head] which Dr. Kidd used in reviewing "La Siège apostolique" in *Theology*, and which is quoted in the Avant-Propos of "Catholicisme et Papauté." It is true that Mgr. Batiffol said no more of the theory than that it reminded him of Gallicanism (p. 11) but surely he rejects it implicitly by his several declarations of the Catholic doctrine that the Pope is infallible, alone or with the Episcopate. So the Vatican Council defined and so all Catholics believe. We are not contending that Mgr. Batiffol, or any other Catholic theologian, is divinely preserved from error in his writings: only that when he states the Church's teaching his words should not be wrested from their plain and proper meaning.

The
Condemnation of
"Rotary."

To a question submitted by not a few Bishops to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation as to whether the clergy should be permitted to become members of "Rotary Clubs" or to join in their meetings, the answer, given after mature consideration, was "it is not expedient": it is published in the February issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Following on this decision, although not necessarily inspired by it, for it has been anticipated in many dioceses, the Spanish hierarchy have warned all the faithful in Spain to have nothing to do with the "Rotary" movement, or with any similar association framed on merely humanitarian lines. In Italy a similar pronouncement has been made. It is, therefore, evident that the Rotarians have come under suspicion in Catholic countries, and the reason is not far to seek. Although the aims of the Association, which started in Chicago in 1905¹ but

¹ Its name arose from the practice of its members meeting in rotation at each others' houses.

has since become international, are ostensibly ethical, they found morality, not on religion but on a basis of reason and expediency. God's law as the rule of conduct, God's love as its motive, are set aside. "It is one of the most blessed things in Rotary," writes¹ the Chairman of the International Service Sub-Committee of Great Britain, "that men of every grade and variety of religious thought *are content to leave these things outside* the sphere of club influence." It is all very well for those who have no fixed faith and whose religion is based on a number of shifting hypotheses, to free their intercourse from what might be only a cause of dissension, but no true Catholic can thus turn his back on the motives and sanctions of his religion, since they are of the essence of his morality. These humanitarian cults, although excellent in object, promoting unselfishness, justice, and brotherly love, are woefully defective in method. There is nothing that they have at heart that the Catholic is not taught by his Faith to pursue more ardently, and he finds that the only way to observe the second Commandment perfectly is to perfect himself in the observance of the first. Rotary, on the other hand, practically eliminates the first in the endeavour to practise the second exclusively. It is one of the many forms of naturalism to which those who have lost effective belief in supernatural revealed religion inevitably tend, if they want to lead decent and respectable lives. But Christians who still believe have rightly no use for it.

Literary Censorship.

It is unfortunately the case that the publicity given to indecent books by police prosecution of their publishers tends to neutralize the advantage to morality gained by their suppression. A book condemned here will be bought more readily by the prurient in other countries, and several unabashed pornographers have made large fortunes by peddling their filthy productions abroad at enhanced prices. It is to be hoped that the League of Nations may some day agree that immoral books, no less than the grosser forms of incentives to vice, will be banned universally, once they have been condemned in any one country. But meanwhile, police censorship must be maintained, for, clumsy barrier as it is, it is the only protection a de-Christianized community has against the "emancipated." Considering to what lengths conscience-less authors go at present, when prosecution is possible, in exploiting man's lower instincts, we shudder to imagine the deluge of nastiness to which we should be exposed if that barrier were removed. In this connection, the Free State Government is rumoured to be weakening on its Censorship Bill. We look to the Catholicism of Ireland to permit no backsliding in the matter. The Hierarchy are alive to

¹ *Review of Reviews*, Jan., 1929, p. 57.

the danger and some of its members are refreshingly outspoken. There are some words from Dr. Fogarty, the Bishop of Killaloe, spoken last December but worthy of recall:—

Every honest man [he stated] knows the foul stuff against which that Bill is directed. . . . There is no fear for decent liberty in Ireland, except from the so-called advocates of liberty themselves. Nor is this country going to be intimidated by the pompous pretensions of a little clique of intellectuals in Dublin. . . . I hope the country will back up the Government in its laudable effort to preserve the cleanliness and nobility of life from this pagan ooze of sensuality that threatens both with ruin.

More recently in their Lenten Pastorals other Bishops have voiced the same expectation. The Bishop of Galway, for instance, refers to the coterie of modern pagans in Dublin, who have besmirched, as far as their influence goes, Ireland's reputation for cleanness, in the pungent phrase—"The vapourings of those who regard themselves as shining lights in a dark place, who glorify Animalism and call it Art." This is another form of naturalism, still more condemnable than the former.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Mass, Impetratory effects of [Rev. D. Barry in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Dec. 1928, p. 525; Mass-Theory, reply to critics of his, M. de la Taille in *Gregorianum*, Feb. 1929, p. 190].

Primacy and Apostleship [*Tablet*, Feb. 2, 1929, p. 143].

Spiritism, Moral Character of [M. J. Brown, D.D., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Feb. 1929, p. 113].

Wicksteed, Dr., misrepresents St. Thomas [L. Walker, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, Dec. 1928, Jan. and Feb. 1929].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglican Modernism shown in Dr. Gore's Bible Commentary [E. F. Sutcliffe in *Month*, Feb. 1929, p. 126].

Catholic Defence by Laymen in Georgia [R. Reed in *America*, Jan. 12, 1929, p. 328].

Convert Movement in Germany [J. Bolten, D.D., in *Catholic World*, Feb. 1929, p. 599].

Coulton, Dr. G. G.: his curious methods of controversy [Rev. B. Grimley, in *Catholic Times*, Jan. 25, 1929, p. 9].

Education, Liberty of, in various countries [G. de Monti's book discussed in *Revue Apologetique*, Feb. 1929, p. 146].

Goudge's, Dr., attack on Catholicity refuted [O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.S.S.R., in *Month*, Feb., March, 1929, pp. 140 and 243].

Prejudice: its vitality [W. J. Blyton in *Catholic Gazette*, Feb. 1929, p. 40: "The Case of Conspiracies," G. K. Chesterton in *Universe*, Feb. 8, 1929, p. 7].

Protestant Church Support of Bolsheviks [G. M. Godden in *Tablet*, Feb. 9, 1929, p. 178].

Religion without God: modern phase [G. B. Phelan, Ph.D., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Feb. 1929, p. 113].

Toleration of religious falsehood: its limits [*Catholic Times*, Feb. 15, 1929, p. 14].

Truth vindicated by the Encyclical *Mortalium Animos* [W. J. Kerby in *Ecclesiastical Record*, Feb. 1929, p. 143].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Canada: Religious and Racial Statistics [Dom Maternus, O.S.B., in *Tablet*, Jan. 26, 1929, p. 126].

Catholicism in China, History and Present State [Dr. Barry O'Toole in *Commonweal*, Jan. 25, 1929, p. 340].

Catholicism and Internationalism [G. de Reynold in *Revue Apologetique*, Jan. 1929, p. 45].

Catholicism and the Negro in U.S.A. [Discussion in *Commonweal*, Dec. 26, 1928, p. 236].

Christianity and English Common Law [R. O'Sullivan in *Tablet*, Jan. 26, 1929, p. 121].

Conversion and the Unconscious [C. Bruehl, D.D., in *Homiletic Review*, Feb. 1929, p. 457].

Education Campaign for Justice to Catholics [*Tablet*, Jan. 26, 1929, p. 105].

France, the Missionary Country [S. J. Brown, S.J., in *Studies*, Dec. 1928, p. 649].

International Problem, The, discussed by Catholics internationally [*Revue Apologetique*, Feb. 1929, p. 188].

Negro, Justice denied to the American: Dr. F. J. Gilligan's "Morality of the Colour Line" [*America*, Dec. 8, 1928, p. 200].

Prohibition, in what sense a moral issue [J. C. Calahan, Jr., in *Commonweal*, Feb. 13, 1929, p. 420].

Sweden: State of Church, actual and historical, in [Dom Maternus, O.S.B., in *Tablet*, Feb. 2, 1929, p. 164].

REVIEWS

I—A PROTESTANT ARMOURY¹

DR. CADOUX has compiled a large volume, in which he gathers together nearly everything that has been said by her foes against the Catholic Church. There are whole chapters and many pages devoted to such well-worn controversial topics as the Church's attitude towards Holy Scripture, Our Blessed Lady, Truthfulness, Hell-fire and Eternal Punishment, Persecution, Morality, etc. There are also a couple of chapters dealing with the Papal claims—St. Peter's prerogatives in Holy Scripture and the Papal prerogatives in history.

We cannot say that on any of these matters Dr. Cadoux has thrown new light, but the Protestant controversialist will no doubt use the book as an inexhaustible munition store for propaganda whether on platform or in the Press. For, unlike munitions of war, the shells of anti-Catholic controversy are used over and over again, even though they have been exploded or proved to be "duds." It is therefore a book which should be on the library shelves of professors in seminaries and in the hands of those who have to instruct speakers of the Evidence Guild how to answer difficulties against the Faith. In spite of Dr. Cadoux's own use of the "Catholic Encyclopædia" and "Catholic Dictionary" for his own ends these sources will generally give enough facts and principles to answer his charges against the Church. We have not noticed any particular points which call for new and detailed refutation in *THE MONTH*. The author adds nothing to the attacks of Drs. Salmon and Littledale which have been answered effectively in the past.

What is of more interest to us is the exposition of Dr. Cadoux's own position with regard to the ultimate authority for religious belief. His standpoint appears to be that of the "Ripon Hall" school of Modernism, which is becoming increasingly common as the "school of thought" that is being adopted by liberal Nonconformists as well as Anglicans. He expounds "the ultimacy of the inner light," i.e., "experience," as the final court of appeal, at the bar of which even the utterances of Christ Himself have to be judged by the individual believer, in whose mind the Holy Spirit is immanent and directive. Dr. Cadoux certainly holds that God is our final authority (p. 103), but it is not God revealing Himself through an external authority, or teaching by an infallible mes-

¹ *Catholicism and Christianity: a Vindication of Progressive Protestantism.* By C. J. Cadoux, M.D., D.D. London: Allen and Unwin. Pp. 700. Price, 21s.

senger to mankind—His Church. "There is nothing in the Gospels to suggest that God guarantees to protect the Church against error more completely than he protects the individual" (p. 107). Scripture—the written word of God—is also denied to be infallible: "it is quite true that Anglicans and many others do not—at least normally—understand the acceptance of Scripture as *ultimate* to imply that it is *infallible*" (p. 111). This qualified authority of the Bible is recognized by Dr. Cadoux because much in it is a key that fits the complex wards of the human heart in its best moods. "In the last analysis, the only possible answer to our question is, that the ground for believing the Bible to be inspired beyond any other book is that, more than any other book, it comes home to the individual, it speaks to his condition, it answers the deepest needs of his own life, it saves him, as he sees that it has saved and still saves others" (p. 119). "Because so much of what is written (in the Bible) evokes the glad approving recognition of *our own inward sense of the Divine*" (ib).

Dr. Cadoux meets the obvious objection that his final authority is in the ordinary accepted sense purely *subjective* by his insistence on "the light and leading of the Divine Ruler of the universe in the Inner Witness of mind and heart," as "the only final corrective of our errors, the only real guarantee of our ultimate arrival at truth" (p. 166). "Despite all uncertainty and temporary confusion, we shall be led by our very limitations to draw closer to the ultimate Divine authority within, and to discover in that a surer guide than any external witness concerning whom we may dispute" (p. 175).

Our author naïvely justifies the right of human reason, *i.e.*, of the reader, aided by his "inner light," to correct or, if need be, reject the "hard sayings" of Scripture, by appealing to the example of Christ "who in the Sermon on the Mount superseded the dictates of the Mosaic Law" (p. 189). "In essence and principle [he argues] the critical attitude to Scripture may certainly claim to have the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ." If *He* can criticize and amend why not we? appears to be the principle whereby free criticism is justified; as if ordinary human beings stood in the same relation to Scripture as did Christ! "The ultimate validity [he goes on] of the human reason and conscience—even as against the letter of Scripture—is everywhere presupposed" (p. 189). Thus, we note, this Protestant champion, true to the spirit of Modernism, does not regard Our Lord as an infallible authority. After discussing and dismissing other alternatives in regard to difficulties in the New Testament, Dr. Cadoux accepts the conclusion "*that Jesus said at least some of these things (i.e., the 'hard sayings') and was mistaken in saying them.* Apart from wide differences in application, this principle is now very generally accepted by orthodox [sic] Protestant scholars. . . . Belief in Jesus'

infallibility and omniscience is frankly given up by a large number of leading Protestant scholars, though most of them carefully guard themselves by limiting His limitations in some strict way" (p. 217).

Our Lord's belief in Hell-fire and the eternity of its duration is explained by His education, that of an ordinary Eastern of His race and age. "If Jesus accepted the Aramaic language and idiom, the teachings of the Old Testament generally and the current thoughts of His race and time on secular matters, it is not unreasonable to suppose that He would take for granted the main outlines of that eschatological theodicy with which the Apocalyptists had familiarized the Jews. . . ." However, "by that very Spirit which proceeds continually from Him we are helped to distinguish between the temporal and the eternal in the utterances which He is stated to have made on earth. The Gospel teaching, therefore, while it convinces us unmistakably of the tragic seriousness of sin and the just severity with which our loving Father visits it, cannot fairly be claimed as necessitating belief in the unending torment of hell-fire or even the final and irreparable perdition of a single soul" (p. 527).

That is to say, the Modernist "Christian" is in a better position to know the truth than Christ,—God became man in order to bear witness to it!

We have quoted enough to make it clear whither Modernism leads those who adopt its "critical" principles. Dr. Cadoux's book emphasizes the truth that Catholicism is the only foe that Modernists have to fear in their desperate attempt to make Christianity palatable to paganized England by eliminating its supernatural and authoritative character. In many parts of his work Dr. Cadoux does not distinguish between Catholicism and "Anglo-Catholicism"; but he seems to realize, when he deals explicitly with the latter, that the battle is in reality won over those who appeal to "Catholic authority" without recognizing the Church, wherein alone that authority is embodied.

We have not space to criticize in detail our author's analysis of the Act of Faith, but content ourselves with noting that he confuses the *approach* to faith, made by the study of the apologetic *præambula* on the part of one seeking the Church, with the act of belief itself, made by those who have found the infallible teacher and through her been put in touch with "the authority of God revealing" from without. Nor is that act of faith simply the conclusion of a syllogism, an inference, whose certainty is of the same strength as the weakest link in the chain of the approach to faith. Nor does Dr. Cadoux, in his purely rational analysis, seem to take any account of the "lumen fidei" and of the power of actual grace and the infused habit of faith in his criticism of the Catholic position, while with a certain incongruity he elevates his own

"Inner Light" almost to the level of private revelation. The Rationalist Press Association will, we fear, get more support from this Protestant apologist than will the unstable Christianity of the sects.

2—THE REAL PRESENCE¹

THE sub-title of this little work describes it as a study of "the localization in cultus of the Divine Presence." The author thinks that the worship of images, the cult of sacred places and objects and the sacramental system in general represent a cycle of religious ideas which has a certain psychological and logical unity, and which ought to be studied as a single whole. To these ideas he gives the general name of localization. A certain class of worshippers, including by far the larger number of Christians in every age, finds access to God through material vehicles, wherein divine powers, and in one sense or another, the Divine Presence, are believed to be lodged. Another class of worshippers—Puritans, iconoclasts, Mohammedans and so forth—profess to be hindered rather than helped by ritual and sacraments. It is, according to Dr. Bouquet, a conflict of temperaments; it would be more true to describe it as a conflict of fundamental philosophies. He does, indeed, seem to realize that the very principle of the Incarnation is at stake. There is no question that in Christ—the Christ of Christendom—Divine Powers and the Divine Presence have been localized and "dwelt amongst us." But this fact does not appear to have much weight with Dr. Bouquet. That Protestantism issues logically in Unitarianism is a conclusion that would probably trouble him very little. He quotes with apparent approval (p. 97) the silly retort of some unnamed Unitarian celebrity, who, when questioned on this subject, exclaimed, "I deny the Divinity of Christ? I do not deny the Divinity of any man." Dr. Bouquet's comment is as follows: "He was of course asserting his adherence to a fact of experience, *i.e.*, that there is in each one of us a certain spark of Divinity; but he would be a rash individual who claimed that in each ordinary person there was an equal degree of the Divine Spirit localized, or that the presence of the Divine Spirit in the average man justified our giving to that average individual the same degree of worship which we feel justified in giving to the person of Christ." The exegesis is worthy of its text.

Dr. Bouquet claims (p. 84) that he has "tried to be as fair and sympathetic as possible in my estimate of the position of those who (in the Anglican Church) desire to tolerate some kind of extra-liturgical devotion." Whether the Anglo-Catholics will recognize his statement of their case as either sympathetic or equitable, it is not for us to pronounce. He has certainly not stated the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence anywhere in the course of his essay. He seems to think (p. 83) that the Catholic doctrine can

¹ *The Real Presence.* By A. C. Bouquet, D.D. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 98. Price 4s. net.

be whittled down to a mere piece of symbolism. "Indeed, so long as the language of the Catholic pratiquant only involves that the elements *mean* the Presence of Christ in the sense that G O D *means* the Deity, it is hard to see any serious objection to a localized cultus. It may be said that to concentrate locally on a consecrated wafer in order to perceive the omnipresent spirit may be arbitrary, since it would be quite as reasonable to concentrate upon the figure of Christ whether depicted in a stained glass window or projected on to a sheet by a lantern, or even to concentrate upon a lily in a vase on the altar or on a common bush in the churchyard." It is surely an amazing exhibition of theological ignorance, if Dr. Bouquet supposes, as I think he honestly does, that he has really got to grips with the Catholic doctrine in this passage. Of course, if there were questions merely of recalling the Presence of God, any object, a picture, a lily or a common bush, might be employed indifferently. But in the Catholic doctrine, as every Catholic child understands it, there is question of the Incarnate Presence, that is to say, the Presence of the true Body and Blood of the Incarnate Word under the sacramental veils. Dr. Bouquet, of course, simply disbelieves this doctrine; probably, as we have seen, disbelieves the Incarnation itself. But he might at least have tried to understand it, and to expound it correctly. Had he done so, he might have found some of his comparisons of Catholicism with the alleged superstitions of the benighted Hindu, a little impertinent, in every sense of the word; and those whom he calls "his Catholic friends" might have been spared the insult on p. 93, "There is a real principle involved in resistance to *this return to the jungle*," i.e., in resistance to that doctrine of the Eucharist which, on the author's own admission, is held by the vast majority of Christians throughout the world. Such language should be left to Dr. Barnes.

3—AN ESSAY IN WHITEWASHING¹

AT the present day, psychological biography is all the vogue; due, no doubt, to the wide interest in psycho-analysis, the prevailing impressionism of modern art, and on the part of the public, to the picture habit acquired from the cinema. To-day an author, writing a life, endeavours to seize the leading characteristics of his subject, and with the aid of these, by a few graphic touches to produce a vivid impressionistic sketch. The resultant biography is generally far shorter, more living, appeals more to the imagination, captures interest more easily and makes far less demand on the powers of the reader than the old style of life, where fact upon fact was accumulated and the character left more or less to be deduced from these. There is, however, far greater danger in the new method of the author being carried

¹ *Louis XIV., The Sun-King*. By Louis Bertrand. Translated by C. B. Chase. London: Longmans. Pp. viii. 366. Price, 18s. net.

away by his own subjective impression; and to what perversion this may lead has been shown, not long since, by the blasphemous portraiture of our Lord given to the world by Emil Ludwig. To this new type of biography M. Louis Bertrand's *Louis XIV.* clearly belongs. The author declares his aim explicitly. "I shall examine Louis XIV. psychologically," he writes, "and shall attempt to understand the inner workings of his mind before pronouncing judgment upon his actions; I undertake this task as an historian and novelist who is interested in following the intellectual and spiritual reactions of a very unusual man." Unfortunately, in the result, the novelist has eclipsed the historian and given us a description of Louis XIV., interesting it may be, but hardly consonant with historical fact. Nobody, indeed, denies that the "Roi Soleil" possessed great and exceptional powers. But it was not enough for our author to expatiate on these; he must needs extol him with praise in every sphere of activity, as king, statesman, general, patron of the Arts and Letters and the like,—a praise as excessive and indiscriminating as it is monotonous in its insistence. On the other hand, the king's egotism and self-worship, his lust for dominion, his final reduction of the nobility to a privileged class without duties, his disregard of the miseries of his people, and of the intolerable burdens placed upon them by his wars:—all this and the like is explained away or passed over in strange silence. Even his blatant immorality is shockingly palliated. The king, forsooth, observed outer convention; his mistresses moreover were few; they can all be named without difficulty; and after all, "such youthful sowing of wild oats is never taken seriously!" Perhaps after this, one reads with less surprise the author's opinion that, as one learns more about Louis XIV., "one comes to look upon him as the highest type of the Latin that the world has ever seen!" The book, possibly, may be taken as symptomatic of an exaggerated nationalism, rife, indeed, in the reign of Louis XIV., but prevalent still in the world of to-day and not least so in France. It may, however, serve a useful purpose, by exemplifying the dangers of psychological biography.

SHORT NOTICES.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

IT would be difficult to bring together into a short volume of 180 pages more of the ideas of God in the many modern philosophies than is contained in *Gott, Fünf Vorträge über das Religionsphilosophische Problem*, by Fr. Erich Przywara, S.J. (Oratoriums-Verlag, Pustet, München). In five essays the author surveys the field. First he exposes the Question of God as it has been approached by the various thinkers since Kant, dividing these into groups. Next he compares these concepts of

God with the concepts of earlier ages. In the third essay he becomes more positive, showing in eloquent language what is meant by God within us and God above us, and what it has meant in the past. The fourth treats of God mainly in history, which introduces the Godhead as seen in Christ our Lord. Lastly comes God in the soul and in the community; that is, God working in and through the Church. Naturally this last essay is virtually an exposition of the teaching of St. Paul and St. John. Some fifty pages of notes, and a copious index of proper names, help the reader to realize the amazing amount of study that has gone to the making of this book.

DEVOTIONAL.

A very attractive little manual of prayers for children, called **Our Father's House** (Gill and Son, Dublin), has been compiled by Father Aloysius, O.S.F.C., plentifully illustrated and daintily printed, with explanations of all services suited to youthful capacity.

Father J. Bruneau, of the Congregation of St. Sulpice, which specializes, so to speak, in inculcating and practising sacerdotal perfection, has embodied in **Our Priestly Life** (John Murphy Co.: \$1.25) the essence of Sulpician teaching on the subject, confirmed by many quotations from masters of the Spiritual Life. It is a golden little book, condensing into a short space a wealth of inspiration and help, and containing at the end M. Olier's spiritual testament,—the famous *Pietas Seminarii Sancti Sulpitii*.

In twelve short chapters, instinct with true piety and saturated with Holy Scripture, Father Robert Eaton offers, in his **In Newness of Life** (Sands: 2s.6d. n.), certain specifics against the spirit of worldliness so prevalent even amongst the faithful to-day. Even as St. Paul's hearers, we too are called "to walk in newness of life" and to substitute Christ's principles, as exemplified in His life, for those of unregenerate man. Father Eaton shows us what to do and how and why, without making void the Cross of Christ, nor on the other hand frightening the sinner from His service. Bishop Barrett in his Preface stresses the need of such teaching nowadays.

If we say that **Jeunes et Vieux Ménages**, by the Abbé Charles Grimaud (Téqui: 11 fr.), is a book written avowedly to keep daughters-in-law and mothers-in-law from quarrelling we shall have given the best account of its contents. The author confesses in his preface that such is his object, and that he knows he is skating on thin ice: *Il ne faut pas se dissimuler que la tâche est délicate*. Nevertheless he skates well and the ice holds, perhaps all the better because the author takes himself somewhat seriously.

Those who seek for a new book of meditations for every day in the year will find it in **Ma Vie de Fils Adoptif de Dieu**, by Father Ch. Chouzier (Téqui: 4 vols., 10 fr. per vol.). The author has chosen a new course. Each month is devoted to a special subject, e.g., The Blessed Trinity (February), The Word Incarnate (March), The Redeemer (April), and so on. For each day we are given points for meditation, a selection for spiritual reading from some well-known author, and a short notice of the saint or feast of that day. Much labour has evidently gone to the making of these four little volumes, which are full of good material for prayer.

CANON LAW.

To the commentaries on the whole of the Code of Canon Law must be added that of Dr. Adrien Cance, professor at the Grand Séminaire of Rodez—*Le Code de Droit Canonique, Commentaire succinct et pratique* (Gabalda: 25.00 fr.)—of which two volumes have appeared. The first volume after an introduction, which contains among other things a useful bibliography, deals with Canons 1—486: the second gets down to Canon 1153, and so includes the law relating to religious and the sacraments. A third volume will complete the work. Each of these volumes has a fairly good Index.

The author very justly calls his work a succinct and practical commentary on the Code. The explanation of the law of the Church is put shortly and yet not as a rule so shortly as to be of little use in the more difficult points: the practical side is nearly always kept in view. Dr. Cance is well read in the literature of the Code as his references show: he has also studied carefully all the authoritative interpretations that were at his disposal as well as the other Roman decisions that bear on his work. A few points of criticism:—

It is doubtful whether the definition of "dubium iuris" (I. p. 54.) as it stands is helpful: the practical definition is that such exists when there is disagreement among Canonists on a point of law. The statement (I. p. 64) that a personal precept has no validity unless certain conditions are fulfilled, is clearly against the wording of the Canon which is being explained. The interpretation (I. p. 168) of the circular letter of the Congregation of the Council seems to be unwarrantably extended to all priests taking a holiday. We should have been glad to have had the author's explanation of "Ordinarius" in Canon 883 §1. The explanation of the difficult phrase "baptizati in Ecclesia Catholica," in Canon 1070 is neither satisfactory nor helpful. The key to its interpretation in the case of the children of apostate Catholics or non-Catholics is given in Canons 750 and 751. Some further explanation is needed for practical purposes in the discussion of conditions in a marriage contract which are opposed to the essential qualities of marriage.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

Whatever else this is, *Apostatenbriefe*, by Robert Kosmas Lewin (Rauch: 10 m.), is a solid and serious work. It is a mighty effort to lay bare the reasons which induced the author—a Jewish doctor and biologist—to become a Catholic. It is well written and original. The letters of which the book is formed are addressed to Jewish friends. The first half will appeal equally to all readers, whereas the second has a good deal of local German colouring. It would be an extraordinarily difficult book to translate; but one would clearly like to see the essence of it set out in plain straightforward terms: it might well help other strong souls struggling on the road to Damascus. His estimate of the spirituality of modern Judaism as known to him is very low.

Collected from various periodicals, the *Little Lives of Great Tertiaries* (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d.), written by Miss Marian Nesbitt, form an edifying volume from which many besides St. Francis's followers may draw

strength and inspiration. There are nearly a score of lives depicted here, all leading to sanctity through every diversity of position and circumstance.

The drama of St. Aloysius Gonzaga's short life—his strength of will and the worldly obstacles it faced and overbore—is vividly retold in *A Nobleman of Italy* (Sands: 3s. 6d. n.), which Father D. Donnelly, S.J., has translated into vigorous English from the German of Father A. Koch, S.J. It conveys a lesson which should never be forgotten, for all Christians are called to the same fight, however far they may fall short of the Saint's heroism.

Until the ecclesiastical court which is examining the extraordinary spiritual experiences of Teresa Helena Higginson has pronounced on the claims made on her behalf no prudent judgment can be formed by the ordinary reader. Miss Cecil Kerr, however, has done a useful service by publishing an abridgment of her larger work under the title *Teresa Helena Higginson: School Teacher and Mystic* (Sands: 1s.), for, quite apart from her written "revelations," the story of this laborious and charitable life is full of edification.

Miss E. K. Sanders has added one more to her interesting studies of saints, in *St. Francois de Sales, 1567-1622* (S.P.C.K.: 12s.). But of this volume we would say that it is rather a sequel to her study of St. Jane Frances de Chantal than an independent work of its own. In the praiseworthy effort to depict the saint in his surroundings, and to bring out his fascinating human side, she seems to us to have left much to be filled in by the reader from other sources, although in her aim, so far as it goes, she has succeeded. The Life proper occupies less than half of the book; for a fuller portrait we must still depend on Hamon, and those who have drawn from him. The second part, dealing with the origin and content of the saint's two great works, the "Introduction to a Devout Life" and "The Treatise on the Love of God," is much more successful. In this she is on much more familiar ground; indeed, her summaries will help not a little those to whom the style of St. Francis de Sales may seem quaint and diffuse and at times beside the mark. Though phrases here and there betray that the author is not a Catholic, still the spirit of the book is sound.

Those who have enjoyed the skill and thoroughness with which Father Vassall-Phillips, in the current and February issues of this periodical, has demolished a particularly insidious attack upon Catholicism, will turn with interest to the veteran Redemptorist's account of, and reflections upon, his own conversion in the fascinating volume he styles *After Fifty Years* (Sheed and Ward: 4s. n.). There they will read how one, born in utter Protestantism, was induced to think sympathetically of Catholics by the very way in which he heard them denounced—a not infrequent experience—and how through school-days at Eton, travel in Italy, and High Church influence at Oxford he was ultimately brought into the Fold, on the eve of his 21st birthday. The book is divided naturally into his experiences before and after the "Leap," the first portion being mainly historical, the second apologetic, although this division of subject is not at all clear-cut. As one who had touched Anglican life at all points the author's description of its felt inadequacy is very striking, and as one who has spent a long

life in expounding and defending the Catholic Faith, his "philosophizing" on his experiences is both deep and clear. Particularly valuable is his treatment of the "gift" of faith, which is so generally misunderstood outside the Church. The book is enlivened by amusing anecdotes, touches of humour, and vivid pictures of his contemporaries. It is interesting to note amongst the small group of Catholics "up" at Oxford in his time, two who later achieved considerable literary fame, Father Gerard Hopkins and Mgr. Bickerstaff-Drew.

Father Vassall-Phillips says little about his own work for the Faith by voice and pen after his ordination at the age of 27. We may mention in this connection one out of the goodly list of volumes to his credit, a reissue of the first part of *Catholic Christianity*, entitled **Is the Christian Religion True?** (B.O. and W.: 1s.6d.), which, being short and handy and clear and conclusive should be a favourite study in C.E.G. circles or in that wider body, the Apostolic League. For if the modern "after-Christian" is persuaded in spite of the Modernists that Christianity *is* true, it will not be hard to convince him that Catholicity is Christianity. Father Knox, another Eton and Balliol convert, contributes a penetrating and witty preface on the present state of the religious arena.

VERSE.

Miss M. Michael, whose first collection of poems called *Tramp Things* was noticed here some time back, has issued another—**Songs of the South and The Hidden Land** (Talbot and Co.: 2s.6d. n.). The bulk of the "Songs" concern sights and incidents of foreign travel and combine shrewd poetic observation with sufficient command of rhyme and metre. The "Hidden Land" is a little drama with Celtic mythology for subject, too interspersed with Gaelic phrases and clouded with Gaelic mysticism for easy reading.

The old theme of Epiphany has been made the subject of a mystery-play, **The Three Kings** (Sands: 1s. n.), by F. J. Bowen, enacting the great drama of the Manifestation to the Gentiles in grave and dignified language.

FICTION.

In **The Bride Adorned** (Constable: 7s.6d. n.) Mr. D. L. Murray makes a gallant attempt to understand Catholicism, succeeds up to a point and then fails the more lamentably for his very success. The novel concerns the last years of the Temporal Power, and shows a considerable knowledge both of Roman topography and history. It is written with cultivated literary skill and, but for the flaw above-mentioned,—an inability to realize that Catholicism is, not a fine but possibly mistaken ideal, not a matter of temperament or sentiment nor a mere elaboration of natural religion, but a reasonable submission of intellect to the facts of divine revelation, amongst them the divine institution of the Church, and a close adhesion of will to God so manifested—it might have been a great book. But the author's Catholic types are unreal, and in the end, what with "Black Cardinals" and cadaverous priests, the book shrinks into mere Hocking-ese. No Catholic need read it nor can recommend it.

SOCIOLOGY.

Probably nowhere more than in Germany since the War has the clash been felt between old traditions and the new outlook with its new ideals. In *Deutsche Sozialpolitik und deutsche Kultur* (Herder: 2.80m.) Dr. Theodor Brauer, Professor in the Technical High School of Karlsruhe, examines the effect of these new conditions, especially on the working classes and the poor. He is anxious and he gives a warning. While Germany adapts itself to the perspective represented chiefly by America, he would have it be careful not to absorb the individual in the mass, which is the end of all true intellectual progress. The book is a defence of labour from a somewhat different standpoint than that usually taken; and while it sanctions progress, yet it bids Germany not lose its old ideals of culture for the individual. We regret that we are somewhat late in noticing this book, which first appeared in 1926, but its value has not decreased in the interval.

NON-CATHOLIC.

There is a spirit of genial encouragement, gained chiefly by making not-too-much of difficulties and problems, in *The New Learning and the Old Faith*, by the late Canon Arthur W. Robinson, of Canterbury (Longmans: 3s. 6d. n.). The Canon suggests in his Preface that this is his *Nunc Dimittis*, and events have proved it to be true. We commend his optimism; we wish we could commend every argument by which he maintains it. The Canon was evidently a deeply religious man; perhaps in his older age his sight failed him a little. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The oldest Christian traditions of England centre around the ruined Abbey of Glastonbury which is said to be the burial place of St. Joseph of Arimathea, and also to be connected with the King Arthur of legend. The Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, and consequently closely identified with Glastonbury to-day, has, in two lectures, called *Two Glastonbury Legends* (Cambridge University Press: 2s. 6d. n.), and appropriately illustrated, discussed with great learning and critical ability the truth about these venerable stories, and, although many questions prove incapable of solution, we have probably in this slender book all that can be known with certainty.

"Out of their own mouths," *i.e.*, from testimony almost wholly provided by modern spiritualists, does Father Herbert Thurston, S.J., condemn, in *Modern Spiritualism* (Sheed and Ward: 1s. n.), the futilities, inconsistencies, and bad influences of that prevalent superstition. From the writings and "revelations" of Sir A. Conan Doyle and Mr. D. Bradley he is able to illustrate without difficulty the atheism and immorality at the basis of their "spiritual" teaching. This little book should do much to open the eyes of the dupes of Spiritualism.

Kenelm Henry Digby, converted at Cambridge in 1825 and author of a number of long literary and philosophical books, wrote for an age of leisure, and an age of hurry has forgotten him. Out of the vast mine of his *Broadstone of Honour*, compiled when still an undergraduate and rewritten when he became a Catholic, Father Nicholas Dillon, O.F.M., has selected a number of passages and published them as

Maxims of Christian Chivalry (Harding and More: 2s.). Here we find, as in Sir Thomas Browne, the fruits of wide reading and deep reflection, presented, so to speak, in tabloid form, but palatable and nourishing no less on that account. It is a book of which Catholics should be proud, and perhaps these fragments of ore will send many readers to the quarry.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Something out of the common in the way of devotional books is **The Catholic Evidence Guild Prayer Book** (Sheed and Ward: 6d.), a slim small octavo, easily pocketed and full of the theory and practice of the Lay Apostolate. It is a mark of the growth and consolidation of the C.E.G. that it should now have its own collection of devotions directed to the furtherance of its own activities. Since the book lays proper stress on prayer, it should, we think, have included the "common" of that prayer of prayers, the Mass.

A magazine of exceptional interest, both in itself and on account of the happier prospects it suggests of the Church in China, is the fifth issue of the **Bulletin of the Catholic University of Peking** (Oct. 1928: published by the China Mission Office, St. Vincent Arch-Abbey, Latrobe, Pa., U.S.A.). The University is under the charge of Benedictine Fathers, who contribute most of the articles in the periodical. The early history of China, Christian and pre-Christian, forms the chief subject, and it is accompanied by finely-produced illustrations. But there is current history as well, connected with the growth of the hierarchy in China and with the entering into the Benedictine Order of no less a person than the ex-Prime Minister of China! We wish every success to this record of great work done.

The Central Joint Council of the Franciscan Third Order have inaugurated an attractive series of Franciscan Tertiary Saints by a life of **St. Elizabeth of Hungary**, by Father Wilfrid, O.F.M. (sold at the Friary, Forest Gate, E.7, at 1d., or 9d. a dozen).

As ammunition in the struggle for securing educational justice, the Catholic Social Guild has published **The Catholic Schools Campaign** (2d.), by Miss Susan Cunningham, a valuable historical and statistical survey which urges the Catholic case without rhetoric but with all the more force.

Two organizations for promoting International Peace—The League of Nations Society of Ireland, which is undenominational, and the Catholic Council of International Relations—have combined to publish a lecture by Father S. J. Brown, S.J., on **Catholics and the League of Nations**, in which whole-hearted support for that body is urged on purely Catholic grounds. It is deserving of wide circulation as a contribution towards the enlightenment of public opinion.

The Rev. J. E. Moffatt, S.J., thinks rightly enough that even children can be taught to meditate, if dealt with in a reasonable way. Accordingly he has composed a series of reflections on religious events and truths and personalities, which he calls **God's Wonderland** (Benziger Bros.: 10c.), well calculated to interest the child mind and lead it to think with affection on what it reads or hears of.

In the Oct.-Dec. issue of **Chimes**, the attractive magazine issued by Buckfast Abbey, there is an account by Frances Rose-Troup of a recent

discovery amongst the MSS. at Thorndon Hall of a hitherto unknown Anglo-Saxon Charter, the exact locality of which is discussed with great knowledge and ingenuity by the learned authoress.

Shock Troopers of Christ (The America Press: 10c.) is the title of an essay on the spirit and outcome of the famous meditation on the Kingdom in the Exercises, by Father Francis Le Buffe, S.J., showing how capable is the spiritual campaign of arousing the noblest chivalry.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- BURNS, OATES AND WASHBOURNE, London. Paul Mitterre. Pp. 192. Price, 15.00 fr.
- The Sunny Wall.* By Cecily Hallack. Pp. viii. 311. Price, 7s. 6d.
- Junior Bible History.* By Charles Hart. Pp. xi. 243. Price, 3s. 6d.
- The Sacred Passion.* By C. Blount, S.J. Pp. vi. 89. Price, 2s. 6d.
- The Sacrament of Penance.* By H. Harrington, M.A. *The Church on Earth.* By R. A. Knox, M.A. *Faith and Revealed Truth.* By G. D. Smith, Ph.D. (Treasury of Faith Series). Price, 1s. and 2s.
- Newman's Psychology of Faith.* By E. P. Juergens, S.M. Pp. xvii. 288. Price, 7s. 6d.
- C.C.I.R., London. *Catholics and the League of Nations.* By S. J. Brown, S.J. 3d.
- C.T.S., London. *Short History of the Church in England.* By Cardinal Gasquet. Revised Edit. Pp. 123. 1s. n.
- The Antidote.* Vol. III. Compiled by J. Keating, S.J. New issue. Pp. 182. Price, 1s. 6d.
- Theosophy.* By C. C. Martindale, S.J. New revised edit. Pp. 118. Price, 1s. *Several new pamphlets and reprints.*
- HERDER, London. *Ontologia.* By Charles Frick, S.J. 6th revised edition. Pp. x. 248. Price, 6s. 6d.
- La Vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ.* By Dom H. Leclercq. Pp. lxxix. 330. Price, 3s.
- LA BONNE PRESSE, Paris. *Deux Enfants.* Pp. 102. 3 fr.
- Derniers Souvenirs sur G. de Fontgalland.* Pp. 127. 3 fr.
- Une Tête Blonde. Après l'Épouvante.* Both novels by M. Catalany. Price, 5.00 fr. each. *Pie XI.* Pp. 134. 5 fr.
- LIBRAIRIE DE L'ANNOY, Genval. *Saint Bernard de Clairvaux.* By
- LONGMANS, London. *Agricultural Economics.* By George O'Brien. Pp. viii. 195. Price, 10s. 6d. n.
- The Philosophy of Plotinus.* By W. R. Inge. 3rd edit. 2 Vols. Pp. xx. 270: xii. 254. Price, 21s. n.
- LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS, Chicago. *Exhortations, etc. of St. J. F. de Chantal.* Pp. xvii. 478. Price, \$3.00.
- MUUSSES, Purmerend. *The Blessed Virgin Mary in Medieval Drama.* By Dr. J. Vriend, S.J. Pp. 160. Price, 3.50 florins.
- SANDS, London. *Old Testament Lessons for Children.* By A. H. Sidney. Pp. 108. Price, 2s. 6d.
- Prayer for All Times.* Part II. By Pierre Charles, S.J. Pp. 171. Price, 5s. n.
- Newman's Apologetic.* By J. D. Folghera, O.P. Pp. 252. Price, 5s. n.
- Plus X.* By René Bazin. Pp. 273. Price, 6s. n.
- SIMPKIN MARSHALL, London. *In Christ's Heaven.* By Dennis Stoll. Pp. 19. Price, 2s. n.
- W. B. SAUNDERS COMPANY, Philadelphia. *The Soul of the Hospital.* By E. F. Garesché, S.J. Pp. 207. Price, \$1.50.
- TEQUI, Paris. *L'Abbé Leopold Giloteaux.* By P. Giloteaux. Pp. xlii. 253. Price, 12.00 fr.
- THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, New York. *Cosmology.* By J. A. McWilliams. Pp. x. 243. Price, \$2.50.
- THE VINE PRESS, Steyning. *Seven Years.* By Shirley Tarn. Pp. 14. Price, 1s. 6d.
- Day of Life.* By Rold White. Pp. 32. Price, 3s. 6d.

